

---

# FedCache 2.0: Exploiting the Potential of Distilled Data in Knowledge Cache-driven Federated Learning

---

Quyong Pan<sup>1,2</sup> Sheng Sun<sup>1</sup> Zhiyuan Wu<sup>1,2</sup> Yuwei Wang<sup>1\*</sup> Min Liu<sup>1,3</sup> Bo Gao<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>SKL of Processors, Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>2</sup>University of Chinese Academy of Sciences <sup>3</sup>Zhongguancun Laboratory

<sup>4</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology, Beijing Jiaotong University

## Abstract

Federated Edge Learning (FEL) has emerged as a promising approach for enabling edge devices to collaboratively train machine learning models while preserving data privacy. Despite its advantages, practical FEL deployment faces significant challenges related to device constraints and device-server interactions, necessitating heterogeneous, user-adaptive model training with limited and uncertain communication. In this paper, we introduce FedCache 2.0, a novel personalized FEL architecture that simultaneously addresses these challenges. FedCache 2.0 incorporates the benefits of both dataset distillation and knowledge cache-driven federated learning by storing and organizing distilled data as knowledge in the server-side knowledge cache. Moreover, a device-centric cache sampling strategy is introduced to tailor transferred knowledge for individual devices within controlled communication bandwidth. Extensive experiments on five datasets covering image recognition, audio understanding, and mobile sensor data mining tasks demonstrate that (1) FedCache 2.0 significantly outperforms state-of-the-art methods regardless of model structures, data distributions, and modalities. (2) FedCache 2.0 can train splendid personalized on-device models with at least  $\times 28.6$  improvement in communication efficiency. Our code is available at <https://github.com/poppanda/FedCache2.0>.

## 1 Introduction

Federated Edge Learning (FEL) [1, 2] represents a specialized form of Federated Learning (FL) [3] designed to operate at the edge of the network, which enables edge devices (clients) to jointly train machine learning models under the coordination of an edge server (server) without sharing raw data. With the growing prevalence of mobile and Internet of Things (IoT) devices coupled with increasing concerns over data privacy, FEL has empowered wide adoption of various on-device Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications, including smart transportation [4], healthcare [5], and recommendation [6, 7]. Despite its promising potential, FEL faces significant challenges in practical deployment, primarily deriving from device-side limitations and the intricate dynamics of device-server interactions in mobile edge networks. Diverse user behaviors and device capabilities necessitate the deployment of scalable and user-adaptive models tailored to heterogeneous hardware specifications and data distributions across devices [1, 2, 8, 9]. These requirements call for FEL to function efficiently across a wide range of device configurations and user preferences. Additionally, communication constraints, such as limited bandwidth and uncertain connections, further complicate these interactions [1, 10, 11]. Common devices such as smartwatches, mobile phones, and tablets often struggle to sustain excessive wireless communication or ensure consistent connectivity. These limitations hinder the efficiency of collaborative model updates, thereby impacting the overall performance of the FEL system and

---

\*Corresponding Author. [ywwang@ict.ac.cn](mailto:ywwang@ict.ac.cn)

the benefits it delivers to users. While a series of works have explored the trade-offs among the aforementioned constraints [12, 13, 14, 11, 15], they fall short of addressing all the challenges that are simultaneously prevalent in real-world edge deployments [1, 10].

Recently, knowledge cache-driven federated learning (FedCache) [16] has emerged as a game-changer in the FEL field, offering a prevailing paradigm that revolutionizes the mainstream parameters interaction protocol [17, 18, 19, 20, 12, 14, 21, 16] and allowing for the joint addressing of the aforementioned challenges. By maintaining a server-side knowledge cache that stores and organizes on-device logits as transferable knowledge, FedCache facilitates communication-efficient and heterogeneous-compatible distillation-based personalized optimization without relying on unrealistic public datasets [22, 23]. In addition, FedCache eliminates the requirement for multiple devices to remain online simultaneously during training, aligning with the dynamic nature of edge environments. However, the effectiveness of FedCache is limited by the breadth of information available from the remote knowledge cache due to its logits interaction design. Its applicability across various data modalities and application tasks is also restricted by the choice of a task-specific encoder used for extracting sample hashes.

To tackle these limitations, we introduce FedCache 2.0, a novel personalized FEL architecture that improves the performance of heterogeneous on-device models with efficient communication and uncertain connection tolerance. FedCache 2.0 offers a new interaction perspective between devices and the server by incorporating the benefits from both dataset distillation [24] and knowledge cache-driven FL [25], employing privacy-preserving distilled data as the knowledge cached on the server. In this setup, devices perform dataset distillation with the assistance of cached knowledge from the remote server. The distilled data is then shared with the server, ensuring the knowledge cache remains updated with the latest information. To balance system performance and communication efficiency, a device-centric cache sampling strategy is proposed for tailoring transferred knowledge for individual devices within the constraints of available communication bandwidth. The key superiorities of FedCache 2.0 compared with the original FedCache are twofold. First, FedCache 2.0 provides richer information characterization capabilities by storing and transferring distilled synthetic data rather than logits, enabling on-device models to optimize with sufficient server-side information and achieve better precision. Second, FedCache 2.0 adopts a more generalized data anonymization method, enhancing its extensibility to a broader range of data modalities and application tasks. Our proposed architecture maintains the advantages of model heterogeneity allowance, learning personalization, uncertain connection tolerance, and efficient communication from FedCache, while also achieving remarkable performance gains by fully exploiting the knowledge from distilled data.

**Contributions.** The main contributions of this paper are as follows: (1) We propose FedCache 2.0, a novel knowledge cache-driven federated learning architecture for personalized edge intelligence scenarios, enabling efficient post-distillation data-based knowledge storage, organization, and personalized model training while protecting data privacy. (2) We introduce federated dataset distillation and device-centric cache sampling that matches the FedCache 2.0 architecture. The former generates privacy-preserving and semantically-informed synthetic data, while the latter personalizes knowledge cache sampling to accommodate clients with diverse local data distributions and communication constraints. (3) We conduct comprehensive experiments on five datasets, encompassing image recognition, audio understanding, and mobile sensor data mining tasks. Built upon diversified data heterogeneity, model settings, and application scenarios, FedCache 2.0 not only consistently outperforms state-of-the-art methods (at least 1.7% average User model Accuracy [12] enhancement) in all considered settings, but also achieves better communication efficiency (at least  $\times 29.6$ ) compared with baseline algorithms.

## 2 Related Work

**Personalized Federated Learning.** A variety of approaches have been developed to tackle the dual challenges of learning and model scale personalization within FL. Differentiated client-side model optimization objectives are implemented in studies such as [26, 27, 12, 14, 20, 28], enabling trained models to generalize across clients with varying local data distributions. Novel client-server interaction designs, which depart from the traditional FedAvg [17], are explored in [23, 29, 30, 31, 32] to better accommodate diverse client hardware configurations with differently structured models. Furthermore, hybrid approaches such as [25, 13] are proposed to simultaneously address both model and learning personalization in FL.




Figure 1: Comparison of FedCache and FedCache2.0. Results in (c) are derived on the CIFAR-10 dataset, taking  $\alpha = 0.5$  and  $K = 100$ .

**Federated Learning in Edge Computing.** The efficiency of executing FL at the network edge has become a hot topic. Research works such as [33, 34, 35, 36] investigate the technical frameworks required for running FL algorithms on devices constrained by computational power or storage resources. Device heterogeneity and connection uncertainty in edge environments are tackled by methodologies such as [11, 25, 37, 13]. Moreover, [15, 38, 39, 40, 41] extends FL to a multi-tier architecture involving end-edge-cloud collaborations, enhancing model training efficiency and final performance by leveraging the edge as a bridge between devices and the cloud during the training process.

**Federated Learning with Alternative Information.** Instead of transmitting model parameters, alternative information is utilized in the FL training process by a series of recent works. Model-agnostic outputs are exchanged between clients and the server in [25, 42, 32, 31, 43], allowing deployment of customized on-device models across resource-heterogeneous clients. Additionally, methodologies involving uploading mixed or distilled data from clients to servers are proposed in [44, 45], significantly reducing communication overhead while maintaining client data privacy.

### 3 Problem Statement and Reformulation

**Background and Preliminary.** We consider an FL system deployed at the edge of the network, comprising  $K$  participating edge devices (clients) coordinated by an edge server (server). Each client  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$  owns its local dataset  $\mathcal{D}^k = \bigcup_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}^k|} \{(X_i^k, y_i^k)\}$  with  $|\mathcal{D}^k|$  samples, where each sample are with  $D$  data dimensions and belong to one of  $C$  distinct classes. Due to differentiated user behaviors, both the local training an testing datasets among clients are non-independently and identically distributed. Throughout this paper, the terms 'device' and 'client' are used interchangeably. Assume that the personalized model parameters of client  $k$  are denoted as  $W^k \in \mathbb{R}^{d^k}$ , where  $d^k$  indicates the number of parameters in the model of client  $k$ . Due to system heterogeneity among devices, the required model sizes may vary across clients, such that  $d_l \neq d_m, \exists l, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ . Each client  $k$  has a local objective  $\mathcal{L}^i : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which relies on its corresponding local data distribution. The overall goal is to minimize the expected objective across all clients, which is formally expressed as:

$$\min_{\bigcup_{k=1}^K \{W^k\}} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^k|} \sum_{(X_i^k, y_i^k) \in \mathcal{D}^k} \mathcal{L}^i(W^k; X_i^k, y_i^k) \right). \quad (1)$$

Given the instability of device connections in edge environments, multiple clients may not be online simultaneously. Besides, it is essential to minimize the communication overhead between devices and the server under the premise of guaranteeing user model accuracy [12], saving valuable wireless network resources as well as device energy.

**Knowledge Cache-driven Federated Learning.** We formulate knowledge cache-driven FL as a distributed optimization problem with the assistance of the remote knowledge cache  $KC$  on the




Figure 2: Overview of FedCache 2.0.

server, that is:

$$\min_{\bigcup_{k=1}^K \{W^k\}} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}^k|} \left( \sum_{(X_i^k, y_i^k) \in \mathcal{D}^k} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(W^k; \varphi(F^k(X_i^k)), y_i^k) + \beta \cdot \mathcal{R}^k(W^k; KC) \right) \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{CE}$  is the cross-entropy loss,  $\varphi$  is the softmax function,  $F^k$  is the prediction function of the model on client  $k$ .  $\mathcal{R}^k$  represents the redundant optimization component of client  $k$  based on cached knowledge, with corresponding weighting term  $\beta$ . As an example, FedCache [46] considers model outputs (logits) as knowledge, and optimizes local models based on cached related knowledge, that is:

$$\mathcal{R}^k = \sum_{(X_i^k, y_i^k) \in \mathcal{D}^k} \mathcal{L}_{KL}(\varphi(F^k(X_i^k)) || \varphi(\frac{1}{R} \sum_{(zr_i^k)_s \in KC[k, i]} (zr_i^k)_s)), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{KL}$  is the Kullback-Leibler Divergence loss,  $(zr_i^k)_s$  is the  $s$ -th knowledge fetched from the knowledge cache for sample index  $(k, i)$ ,  $R$  is a hyper-parameter that controls the number of related knowledge in FedCache. However, FedCache exhibits severe limitations in providing rich, distribution-aware information for personalized optimization over devices. The amount of information attainable from the remote knowledge cache is significantly restricted due to the design of small-scale logits interactions, as shown in Figure 1 (a). This design fails to offer sufficient optimization information for clients, leading to performance bottlenecks of FedCache, as shown in Figure 1 (c). Additionally, FedCache relies on task-specific data encoders to capture private sample relations, which restricts its applicability across varied data modalities and application tasks.

**FedCache 2.0 Optimization Formulation.** To address the aforementioned shortcomings of FedCache, FedCache 2.0 is designed to revolutionize the transferred knowledge by shifting from logits to distilled data, as shown in Figure 1 (b). Specifically, local model optimization in FedCache 2.0 is regulated by post-sampled distilled data jointly synthesized by clients, that is:

$$\mathcal{R}^k = \sum_{(X^*, y^*) \in Sub^k(\bigcup_{l=1}^K \hat{\mathcal{D}}_{distill}^l)} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(W^k; \varphi(F^k(X^*)), y^*), \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{distill}^l$  is the synthetic data distilled on client  $l$ ,  $Sub^k$  represents the adaptive sample strategy tailored for client  $k$ . In our design, the synthesized data after sampling serves as the knowledge that devices request from the knowledge cache. This reformulation not only provides more comprehensive semantic information for local training on clients but also enhances the control over downloaded cached knowledge, enabling task-compatible and communication-efficient personalized optimization.

---

**Algorithm 1** FedCache 2.0.

---

1: <b>procedure</b> ServerExecute()	1: <b>procedure</b> ClientExecute( $k$ )
2: // Initialization Process	2: // Initialization Process
3: <b>foreach</b> client $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ :	3: <b>foreach</b> class $c \in \{1, 2, \dots, C\}$ :
4: $KC[client, k] \leftarrow \phi$	4:     Compute $p_c^k$ following Eq. (16)
5: <b>foreach</b> class $c \in \{1, 2, \dots, C\}$ :	5:     Send $p_c^k$ to the server
6:         Receive $p_c^k$ from client $k$	6: // Training Process
7: // Training Process	7: Initialize $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k$ following Eq. (8)
8: <b>foreach</b> client $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ :	8: Compute $K_{bl}^k$ following Eq. (10)
9:     Send possible $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k$ following Eq. (8)	9: Compute $K_{bb}^k$ following Eq. (11)
10:    Receive distilled data $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k$ from client $k$	10: Optimize $\mathcal{L}_b^k$ following Eq. (12)
11:    Update $KC$ following Eq. (13)	11: Upload distilled data $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k$ to server
12:    Sample cache following Eq. (17)	12: Receive sampled knowledge from server
13:    Send sampled knowledge to client $k$	13: Optimize $\mathcal{L}_{train}^k$ following Eqs. (14,15)
14: <b>end procedure</b>	14: <b>end procedure</b>

---

## 4 FedCache 2.0

In this section, we introduce our proposed FedCache 2.0 with an overview illustrated in Figure 2. An execution procedure of FedCache 2.0 is elaborated in Algorithm 1.

### 4.1 Knowledge Cache Design

Building upon the principles of knowledge-driven FL, FedCache 2.0 caches the latest distilled data as knowledge on the server side. In terms of knowledge cache operations, we provide two operations for indexing knowledge in the cache.

**Client-Based Indexing.** Each client’s distilled data is indexed by their identifier, allowing for efficient updates of knowledge in the cache and prototype initialization for on-device distillation, that is:

$$KC[client, k] \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{D}}_{distill}^k, \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $KC$  is the notation of the knowledge cache on the server.

**Class-Based Indexing.** All cached knowledge belonging to any specific class  $y^* \in \{1, 2, \dots, C\}$  are jointly fetched, facilitating the subsequent device-centric client sampling process, that is:

$$S_c \leftarrow KC[class, c], \forall c \in \{1, 2, \dots, C\}, \quad (6)$$

where  $S_c$  the set of all knowledge belong to class  $c$  in the knowledge cache, subject to:

$$S_c = \{(X^*, y^*) | (X^*, y^*) \in KC[client, k], k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, y^* = c\}. \quad (7)$$

### 4.2 Federated Dataset Distillation

FedCache 2.0 introduces federated dataset distillation, which collaboratively extracts anonymous structured information from local data on individual clients. This distilled data is stored on the server for further organization and accessibility.

**On-Device Dataset Distillation.** All devices decompose their local models into feature extractors and classifiers. For each given sample  $(X^*, y^*) \in \mathcal{D}^k$  on device  $k$ , the outputs of corresponding feature extractors and classifiers are denoted as  $F_f^k(X^*)$  and  $F_c^k(F_f^k(X^*))$ , respectively. To start dataset distillation, each device  $k$  initializes its prototype by selecting one local sample per class during the first communication round or receiving distilled data from other clients during subsequent communication rounds. The latter process is controlled by a periodically updated random replacement function  $\sigma : \{1, 2, \dots, K\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ , with the intermediate distilled data stored in the knowledge cache, that is:

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k \leftarrow \begin{cases} KC[client, \sigma(k)], & KC[client, \sigma(k)] \neq \phi \\ \mathcal{D}_0^k, & KC[client, \sigma(k)] = \phi \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k$  denotes the set of prototype samples to be optimized into synthetic data after distillation.  $\mathcal{D}_0^k$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{D}^k$  with  $C$  elements, subject to:

$$y_0^k \neq y_0^{k'} \vee y_0^k = y_0^{k'} \wedge X_0^k = X_0^{k'}, \forall (X_0^k, y_0^k) \in \mathcal{D}_0^k \wedge (X_0^{k'}, y_0^{k'}) \in \mathcal{D}_0^k. \quad (9)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume device  $k$  sets up a prototype  $(X_b^k, y_b^k) \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k$  on class  $y_b^k$ . The on-device dataset distillation process should include computing the distance between the prototype's feature maps and those of the local data using the Gram matrix, that is:

$$K_{bl}^k = F_f^k(X_i^k) \cdot F_f^k(X_b^k)^T. \quad (10)$$

Similarly, we compute the Gram matrix of the prototype itself:

$$K_{bb}^k = F_f^k(X_b^k) \cdot F_f^k(X_b^k)^T. \quad (11)$$

The dataset distillation objective  $\mathcal{L}_b^k$  is then optimized following kernel ridge regression loss:

$$\min_{X_b^k} \mathcal{L}_b^k = \min_{X_b^k} \frac{1}{2} \|y_b^k - K_{bl}^k (K_{bb}^k + \lambda I)^{-1} \cdot y_i^k\|^2, \quad (12)$$

where  $I$  denotes the identity matrix, and  $\lambda$  is a hyper-parameter to control the degree of regularization. Note that local data is often augmented using common dataset enhancement techniques to increase the diversity of local feature maps during distillation. After obtaining the distilled data on client  $k$ , it is stored in the knowledge cache  $KC$ , ensuring the devices always have access to the latest distilled knowledge in the following communication rounds, that is:

$$KC[client, k] \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{D}}_b^k. \quad (13)$$

In Appendix A, we will further demonstrate the privacy guarantee of distilled data transmission from devices to the server.

**Collaborative Training.** On-device dataset distillation relies on well-optimized feature extractors. To enhance local model performance and improve future distillation quality, devices periodically request cached distilled data from the server for personalized optimization. This collaborative training procedure is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{W^k} \mathcal{L}_{train}^k \\ = & \min_{W^k} \sum_{(X_i^k, y_i^k) \in \mathcal{D}^k} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(W^k; \varphi(F^k(X_i^k)), y_i^k) \\ & + g\left(\sum_{(X^*, y^*) \in Sub^k(\bigcup_{l=1}^L KC[client, l])} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(W^k; \varphi(F^k(X^*)), y^*)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{train}^k$  denotes the local training loss function on client  $k$ ,  $g$  is a gating function acting as an identity mapping when the knowledge cache is empty in the first communication round and resulting in 0 otherwise, that is:

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} x, & KC[client, k] \neq \phi \\ 0, & KC[client, k] = \phi \end{cases}, \forall x. \quad (15)$$

### 4.3 Device-Centric Cache Sampling

To enhance personalized performance while reducing communication overhead, we propose a device-centric cache sampling strategy that considers local data characteristics and communication budgets.

**Local Label Distribution Computation.** During the initialization process, each client  $k$  computes its local label distribution according to its label frequency, that is:

$$p_c^k = \frac{|\{(X_i^k, y_i^k) | (X_i^k, y_i^k) \in \mathcal{D}^k, y_i^k = c\}|}{|\mathcal{D}^k|}, \quad (16)$$

where  $p_c^k$  represents the label frequency of class  $c$  on client  $k$ .

**Distribution-Aware Controllable Sampling.** During the training process, the knowledge cache samples and distributes its stored knowledge based on  $p_c^k$ , that is:

$$Sub^k(\bigcup_{l=1}^L KC[client, l]) = \bigcup_{c=1}^C RS(KC[class, c], (\tau + (1 - \tau) \cdot p_c^k) \cdot |KC[class, c]|), \quad (17)$$

where  $RS(\hat{D}^*, p_0)$  denotes random sampling in the cached knowledge set  $\hat{D}^*$  at a probability  $p_0$ .  $\tau$  is a hyper-parameter ranging from 0 to 1 to control the trade-off between model performance and communication. As  $\tau$  grows, the proportion of cached samples increases as well, leading to more cached knowledge but higher communication overhead.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Setup

**Platform.** Our experiments are conducted on a high-performance physical server equipped with 12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-12700 CPU and multiple NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU cards. The server’s memory consists of four 16GB Acer DDR4 modules operating at 2133 MT/s, providing a total of 64GB of RAM. Storage is handled by a KINGSTON SKC3000D2048G solid-state drive.

**Datasets.** We evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed FedCache 2.0 across various application tasks, including image recognition, audio understanding, and mobile sensor data mining [47]. These experiments cover five datasets: which are CIFAR10, CIFAR100 [48], CINIC10 [49], UrbanSound8K [50], and TMD [47]. Detailed illustrations of tasks and datasets are provided in Appendix B. Each complete dataset is preprocessed using the distributed data partition strategy from FedML [51], with a hyper-parameter  $\alpha$  to adjust the degree of data heterogeneity among clients.

**Models.** We employ five model structures, considering both deep residual network [52] for image data, and fully connected network for numeric data. Detailed information on model structures is illustrated in Appendix C. In addition, we consider both scenarios with homogeneous and heterogeneous on-device models in our experiments, with detailed model settings provided in Appendix D.

**Baselines.** We compare FedCache 2.0 against the following state-of-the-art methods: MTFL [12], KNN-Per [26], spectral co-distillation for personalized FL (SCDPFL) [53], FedKD [23] and FedCache [25]. These baseline algorithms encompass personalized/multi-task FL methods, FL algorithms addressing dual model heterogeneity and communication efficiency, and FL for edge computing. Implementation details for these algorithms are available in Appendix D.

**Criteria.** Following [12], we adopt the average User model Accuracy (UA) as the primary metric for evaluating model precision, focusing on the highest value achieved within 100 communication rounds. In addition, we assess communication efficiency by monitoring the learning curves, measuring average UA against per unit of communication overhead. Detailed elaborations on how communication cost is calculated are provided in Appendix E.

Table 1: Average UA on image recognition tasks with two degrees of data heterogeneity.

	Method	CIFAR-10		CINIC-10		CIFAR-100	
		$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$
<b>Model Homo.</b>	MTFL	31.1	29.2	32.1	34.8	14.8	15.4
	kNN-Per	32.7	34.8	32.8	29.6	18.8	18.3
	SCDPFL	49.4	33.1	48.7	32.2	33.3	19.6
	FedKD	40.9	23.9	39.2	22.7	26.1	14.3
	FedCache	42.1	23.9	39.8	21.9	26.4	14.7
	<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>23.3</b>
<b>Model Hetero.</b>		CIFAR-10		CINIC-10		CIFAR-100	
		$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$
	FedKD	39.7	24.1	39.6	23.6	26.2	14.1
	FedCache	41.3	22.2	40.3	22.4	26.3	13.9
	<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>23.5</b>




Figure 3: Average UA per unit of communication cost over image recognition tasks.

## 5.2 Performance Evaluation

**Average User Model Accuracy.** Table 1 displays the comparison of average UA on image recognition datasets, CIFAR10, CIFAR100, and CINIC10, with two degrees of data heterogeneity,  $\alpha \in \{0.5, 2.0\}$ . As displayed, FedCache 2.0 significantly outperforms all considered state-of-the-art methods across both model homogeneous and heterogeneous settings, demonstrating its superior performance and robustness in diverse edge scenarios. This substantial improvement is attributed to the enriched information characterization provided by distilled data and effective personalized optimization facilitated by device-centric cache sampling. Additional evaluations on audio understanding and mobile sensor data mining are provided in Appendix G.

**Communication Cost.** Figure 3 illustrates the learning curves for image recognition tasks, plotting average UA against communication cost. As shown, FedCache 2.0 exhibits significantly steeper convergence curves, reaching acceptable average UA more efficiently than competing methods, regardless of data heterogeneity, model structures, and datasets. This indicates that FedCache 2.0 can achieve robust performance improvement with reduced communication overhead, making it suitable for deployment in resource-constrained edge environments with limited wireless bandwidth. The reduction in communication cost is attributed to FedCache 2.0’s elimination of transferring cumbersome model parameters between devices and the server. Alternatively, FedCache 2.0 leverages compact distilled data as knowledge to facilitate communication-efficient personalized optimization on devices. Quantitative communication information and experimental results on additional application tasks are provided in Appendix F and Appendix G, respectively.

## 5.3 Ablation Study

**Impact of Cache Sampling Strategy.** Table 2 presents the average UA with different  $\tau$  values. We can conclude that increasing  $\tau$  in the early stage generally improves the average UA due to the richer information provided by a greater number of cached samples. However, the performance gain diminishes as  $\tau$  approaches 1. This decline is likely due to the introduction of data distribution bias across devices, which is harmful to the system’s performance.



Table 2: Ablation study on cache sampling strategy. Results are derived from the CIRAR-10 dataset with homogeneous models, taking  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

Method	$\tau = 0$	$\tau = 0.3$	$\tau = 0.5$	$\tau = 0.7$	$\tau = 1.0$
FedCache	41.2				
<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	51.3	<b>51.7</b>	51.1	49.8	48.6

Table 3: Ablation study on model settings. Results are derived from image recognition tasks, taking  $\alpha = 0.5$ .

Method	Model	CIFAR10	CINIC10	CIFAR100
FedCache	ResNet-S	40.5	38.3	25.2
	ResNet-S/ResNet-M/ResNet-L	41.3	40.3	26.3
<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	ResNet-S	46.6	46.9	31.5
	ResNet-S/ResNet-M/ResNet-L	<b>51.1</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>35.8</b>

**Impact of Model Settings.** Table 3 presents the average UA for different model configurations across image recognition datasets. The results indicate that heterogeneous model settings yield higher average UA compared to homogeneous settings constrained by the weakest end devices. The improvements stem from the support of more powerful devices to deploy larger and more complex models, which can make full use of computational resources among heterogeneous devices to achieve better performance. These findings underscore the benefits of model heterogeneity flexibility in FedCache 2.0.

## 6 Discussion

**Broader Impacts.** FedCache 2.0 introduces tolerance for uncertain connection, allowing devices to engage in FEL at their convenience, without relying on any two devices being online at the same time. This feature is particularly advantageous in dynamic network environments, especially for IoT applications prone to unstable connectivity from power outages or limited signal coverage. Moreover, FedCache 2.0’s generalized data anonymization broadens its utility across various data modalities and application tasks. For instance, FedCache can be seamlessly integrated into smart healthcare and e-commerce recommendation systems, facilitating personalized trained models’ deployment on smartwatches or mobile phones to monitor users’ health status and shopping preferences.

**Limitations.** In terms of potential limitations of FedCache 2.0, devices may maliciously upload misleading or poisoned distilled data to the server, which could negatively affect the overall system performance. In addition, the dataset distillation process conducted on devices demands considerable computational resources. This request can somewhat lead to slower training procedures on devices with low hardware capabilities or those constrained by battery life.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce FedCache 2.0, a novel personalized FEL architecture to address the challenges of resource heterogeneity, communication limitations, and dynamic network conditions in edge environments. By incorporating the benefits of both knowledge cache-driven federated learning and dataset distillation, FedCache 2.0 facilitates privacy-preserving and semantically enriched knowledge organization and transfer among devices and the server. This is achieved through an iterative process of distilling data on devices, caching them on the server, and then dispatching the cached knowledge to guide local training and subsequent distillation. Moreover, we propose a device-centric cache sampling strategy to further enhance personalized model training by adapting to client data distributions and communication constraints. Extensive experiments on various tasks and datasets demonstrate that FedCache 2.0 outperforms state-of-the-art methods with reduced communication costs, illustrating its potential as a promising solution for personalized edge intelligence scenarios.

## References

- [1] Afaf Tak and Soumaya Cherkaoui. “Federated Edge Learning: Design Issues and Challenges”. In: *IEEE Network* 35.2 (2021), pp. 252–258. DOI: 10.1109/MNET.011.2000478.
- [2] Qiang Duan et al. “Combining federated learning and edge computing toward ubiquitous intelligence in 6G network: Challenges, recent advances, and future directions”. In: *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* (2023).
- [3] Qiang Yang et al. “Federated machine learning: Concept and applications”. In: *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 10.2 (2019), pp. 1–19.
- [4] Xiaoding Wang et al. “AI-Empowered Trajectory Anomaly Detection for Intelligent Transportation Systems: A Hierarchical Federated Learning Approach”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 24.4 (2023), pp. 4631–4640. DOI: 10.1109/TITS.2022.3209903.
- [5] Dinh C Nguyen et al. “Federated learning for smart healthcare: A survey”. In: *ACM Computing Surveys (Csur)* 55.3 (2022), pp. 1–37.
- [6] Wei Yuan et al. “Federated unlearning for on-device recommendation”. In: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 2023, pp. 393–401.
- [7] Yeting Guo et al. “PREFER: Point-of-interest REcommendation with efficiency and privacy-preservation via Federated Edge leaRning”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 5.1 (2021), pp. 1–25.
- [8] Alysa Ziyang Tan et al. “Towards Personalized Federated Learning”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 34.12 (2023), pp. 9587–9603. DOI: 10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3160699.
- [9] Rong Yu and Peichun Li. “Toward resource-efficient federated learning in mobile edge computing”. In: *IEEE Network* 35.1 (2021), pp. 148–155.
- [10] Tuo Zhang et al. “Federated learning for the internet of things: Applications, challenges, and opportunities”. In: *IEEE Internet of Things Magazine* 5.1 (2022), pp. 24–29.
- [11] Zhuangdi Zhu et al. “Resilient and communication efficient learning for heterogeneous federated systems”. In: *Proceedings of machine learning research* 162 (2022), p. 27504.
- [12] Jed Mills, Jia Hu, and Geyong Min. “Multi-Task Federated Learning for Personalised Deep Neural Networks in Edge Computing”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 33.3 (2022), pp. 630–641. DOI: 10.1109/TPDS.2021.3098467.
- [13] Zhiyuan Wu et al. “FedICT: Federated Multi-task Distillation for Multi-access Edge Computing”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* (2023).
- [14] Hai Jin et al. “Personalized edge intelligence via federated self-knowledge distillation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 34.2 (2022), pp. 567–580.
- [15] Zhiyuan Wang et al. “Accelerating federated learning with cluster construction and hierarchical aggregation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* (2022).
- [16] Zhiyuan Wu et al. “Federated Class-Incremental Learning with New-Class Augmented Self-Distillation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00622* (2024).
- [17] Brendan McMahan et al. “Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data”. In: *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR. 2017, pp. 1273–1282.
- [18] Tian Li et al. “Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks”. In: *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 2 (2020), pp. 429–450.
- [19] Sashank J. Reddi et al. “Adaptive Federated Optimization”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=LkFG31B13U5>.
- [20] Zihan Chen et al. “Spectral Co-Distillation for Personalized Federated Learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by A. Oh et al. Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 8757–8773. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/1b86cf4b15cd83b6520d851eb7298228-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/1b86cf4b15cd83b6520d851eb7298228-Paper-Conference.pdf).
- [21] Gihun Lee et al. “Preservation of the global knowledge by not-true distillation in federated learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 38461–38474.
- [22] Lumin Liu et al. “Communication-efficient federated distillation with active data sampling”. In: *ICC 2022-IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE. 2022, pp. 201–206.

- [23] Chuhan Wu et al. “Communication-efficient federated learning via knowledge distillation”. In: *Nature communications* 13.1 (2022), p. 2032.
- [24] Shiye Lei and Dacheng Tao. “A comprehensive survey of dataset distillation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2023).
- [25] Zhiyuan Wu et al. “FedCache: A Knowledge Cache-Driven Federated Learning Architecture for Personalized Edge Intelligence”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* (2024), pp. 1–15. DOI: 10.1109/TMC.2024.3361876.
- [26] Othmane Marfoq et al. “Personalized federated learning through local memorization”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 15070–15092.
- [27] Mingjia Shi et al. “PRIOR: Personalized Prior for Reactivating the Information Overlooked in Federated Learning.” In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by A. Oh et al. Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 28378–28392. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/5a3674849d6d6d23ac088b9a2552f323-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/5a3674849d6d6d23ac088b9a2552f323-Paper-Conference.pdf).
- [28] Zhiqin Yang et al. “FedFed: Feature Distillation against Data Heterogeneity in Federated Learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by A. Oh et al. Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 60397–60428. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/bdcdf38389d7fcef73c4c3720217155-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/bdcdf38389d7fcef73c4c3720217155-Paper-Conference.pdf).
- [29] Jiaqi Wang et al. “Towards Personalized Federated Learning via Heterogeneous Model Reassembly”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by A. Oh et al. Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 29515–29531. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/5e2217482fa75556f1970be809acd3f8-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/5e2217482fa75556f1970be809acd3f8-Paper-Conference.pdf).
- [30] Zhuangdi Zhu, Junyuan Hong, and Jiayu Zhou. “Data-free knowledge distillation for heterogeneous federated learning”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 12878–12889.
- [31] Zhiyuan Wu et al. “Exploring the distributed knowledge congruence in proxy-data-free federated distillation”. In: *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15.2 (2024), pp. 1–34.
- [32] Wenke Huang, Mang Ye, and Bo Du. “Learn from others and be yourself in heterogeneous federated learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 10143–10153.
- [33] Samiul Alam et al. “Fedrolex: Model-heterogeneous federated learning with rolling sub-model extraction”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), pp. 29677–29690.
- [34] Yae Jee Cho et al. “Heterogeneous Ensemble Knowledge Transfer for Training Large Models in Federated Learning”. In: *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*. Ed. by Lud De Raedt. Main Track. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, July 2022, pp. 2881–2887. DOI: 10.24963/ijcai.2022/399. URL: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2022/399>.
- [35] Chaoyang He, Murali Annavaram, and Salman Avestimehr. “Group knowledge transfer: Federated learning of large cnns at the edge”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 14068–14080.
- [36] Tian Wen et al. “RTIFed: A Reputation based Triple-step Incentive mechanism for energy-aware Federated learning over battery-constricted devices”. In: *Computer Networks* 241 (2024), p. 110192.
- [37] Jianchun Liu et al. “Adaptive Asynchronous Federated Learning in Resource-Constrained Edge Computing”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 22.2 (2023), pp. 674–690. DOI: 10.1109/TMC.2021.3096846.
- [38] Zhiyuan Wu et al. “Agglomerative federated learning: Empowering larger model training via end-edge-cloud collaboration”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11489* (2023).
- [39] Yongheng Deng et al. “A hierarchical knowledge transfer framework for heterogeneous federated learning”. In: *IEEE INFOCOM 2023-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE. 2023, pp. 1–10.
- [40] Lumin Liu et al. “Client-edge-cloud hierarchical federated learning”. In: *ICC 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE. 2020, pp. 1–6.

- [41] Zhiyuan Wang et al. “Resource-efficient federated learning with hierarchical aggregation in edge computing”. In: *IEEE INFOCOM 2021-IEEE conference on computer communications*. IEEE. 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [42] Sohei Itahara et al. “Distillation-Based Semi-Supervised Federated Learning for Communication-Efficient Collaborative Training With Non-IID Private Data”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 22.1 (2023), pp. 191–205. DOI: 10.1109/TMC.2021.3070013.
- [43] Daliang Li and Junpu Wang. “Fedmd: Heterogenous federated learning via model distillation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03581* (2019).
- [44] Rui Song et al. “Federated learning via decentralized dataset distillation in resource-constrained edge environments”. In: *2023 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE. 2023, pp. 1–10.
- [45] Seungeun Oh et al. “Mix2FLD: Downlink federated learning after uplink federated distillation with two-way mixup”. In: *IEEE Communications Letters* 24.10 (2020), pp. 2211–2215.
- [46] Lin Wang and Kuk-Jin Yoon. “Knowledge distillation and student-teacher learning for visual intelligence: A review and new outlooks”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2021).
- [47] Claudia Carpineti et al. “Custom dual transportation mode detection by smartphone devices exploiting sensor diversity”. In: *2018 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops (PerCom Workshops)*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 367–372.
- [48] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images”. In: (2009).
- [49] Luke N Darlow et al. “Cinic-10 is not imagenet or cifar-10”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03505* (2018).
- [50] Justin Salamon, Christopher Jacoby, and Juan Pablo Bello. “A dataset and taxonomy for urban sound research”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2014, pp. 1041–1044.
- [51] Chaoyang He et al. “Fedml: A research library and benchmark for federated machine learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13518* (2020).
- [52] Kaiming He et al. “Deep residual learning for image recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [53] Zihan Chen et al. “Spectral Co-Distillation for Personalized Federated Learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by A. Oh et al. Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 8757–8773. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/1b86cf4b15cd83b6520d851eb7298228-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/1b86cf4b15cd83b6520d851eb7298228-Paper-Conference.pdf).

# Appendix

In the appendix, we provide additional details organized as follows:

- Section A illustrates the privacy guarantees of the federated dataset distillation process. It compares raw and distilled data across three image recognition datasets, highlighting how the federated dataset distillation process obscures identifiable visual information to protect user privacy.
- Section B provides an overview of the tasks and datasets used in our experiments. It includes brief introductions of image recognition, audio understanding, mobile sensor data mining, and elaborate descriptions of CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, CINIC-10, UrbanSound8K, and TMD datasets.
- Section C describes the model structures used in our experiments, and provides detailed information of model parameters.
- Section D provides information on the model configurations for both homogeneous and heterogeneous settings, data partition strategies, and hyper-parameter settings across the experiments.
- Section E introduces the methodology for quantifying the communication costs of FL algorithms, including specific measures for different types of transmitted information like model weights, logits, sample index, and distilled data.
- Section F elaborates on detailed quantitative communication costs and efficiency speed-up ratios for image recognition tasks with different degrees of data heterogeneity.
- Section G provides additional evaluations of FedCache 2.0 on audio understanding and mobile sensor data mining tasks. It presents the average user model accuracy and communication efficiency for these tasks, demonstrating the effectiveness of FedCache 2.0 in diverse data modalities.

## A Privacy Demonstration of Federated Dataset Distillation

In this paper, federated data distillation is employed to develop abstract semantic representations on individual devices collaboratively. Figure 4 illustrates the comparison of raw local data and distilled data on three image recognition datasets. As shown in Figure 4, raw datasets on each client feature rich and identifiable visual information, posing severe risks to user privacy. For instance, in the CIFAR-10 [1] dataset, the unprocessed images vividly display the characteristic features of certain common objects such as cars, birds, and planes. Similarly, in the CINIC-10 [2] dataset, the distinct contours of people are clearly discernible. On the contrary, the images become significantly obscured and unidentifiable after distillation. Specifically, the distilled data across all datasets exhibit a substantial reduction in distinct object contours and detailed features, preserving only rudimentary aspects of color and shape. While the transformed data preserves enough statistical attributes for effective local model training, it lacks the granularity necessary for image recovery. Hence, this transformation greatly enhances user privacy by significantly mitigating the risk of personal data leakage when such distilled data is processed centrally on servers.




Figure 4: Visualization of raw data and distilled data over image recognition datasets.




Figure 5: Detailed information of adopted model structures.

Table 4: Number of parameters of adopted models.

Model	ResNet-T	ResNet-S	ResNet-M	ResNet-L	FCN-U	FCN-T
Num. Params.	171.0K	265.9K	360.8K	455.8K	151.3K	162.5K

## B Illustration of Tasks and Datasets

In this section, we provide an overview of the tasks and datasets utilized in our experiments, which span three distinct domains: image recognition, audio understanding, and mobile sensor data mining.

**Image Recognition.** Image recognition is a fundamental task in computer vision, involving the assignment of images into predefined classes based on their visual content, such as color, texture, and shape. In our experiments, we evaluate our method on three image recognition datasets, which are CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 [1], and CINIC-10 [2]. All of these datasets consist of common objects in daily life, represented by vehicles, animals, and humans. They offer a diverse and challenging set of images that test the robustness and precision of FL algorithms in handling visual data.

**Audio Understanding.** Audio understanding involves classifying audio clips into various categories based on their acoustic properties. We employ the UrbanSound8K dataset [3] in our experiments, which contains labeled sound excerpts from 10 distinct classes, including car horns, street music, and children playing. Each sound clip is less than four seconds long, providing a compact yet comprehensive acoustic profile for analysis. This dataset is particularly valuable for evaluating the performance of audio recognition FL systems in naturalistic urban environments.

**Mobile Sensor Data Mining.** Mobile sensor data mining focuses on analyzing data from mobile device sensors to infer user activities or contextual settings. In our experiments, we utilize the TMD dataset [4] designed to identify transportation modes based on smartphone sensor readings. The TMD dataset is ideal for assessing the capability of FL algorithms to process and interpret complex, real-time sensor data in the context of mobile computing.

### C Detailed Information on Model Structures

In this section, we provide detailed descriptions of the model structures used in our experiments. For experiments on image recognition, we employ deep residual network (ResNet) [5] with different numbers of layers to represent models with different structures, which are ResNet-T, ResNet-S, ResNet-M, and ResNet-T. For experiments on audio understanding as well as mobile sensor data mining, we adopt fully connected networks (FCN) that satisfy task-specific inputs and outputs sizes. We provide detailed information on model structures in Figure 5, and the number of parameters of adopted models in Table 4.

### D Implementation Details

In this section, we outline the implementation details of our experiments, elaborating on the model configurations for both homogeneous and heterogeneous settings, the adopted data partition strategy, and the hyper-parameters employed across our experiments.

**Model Configurations.** We conduct experiments in both model-homogeneous and model-heterogeneous settings, respectively. For image recognition experiments with homogeneous models,




Figure 6: Illustration of varying degrees of data heterogeneity with different  $\alpha$  across 10 clients over CIFAR-10 dataset. Each cell's color represents the proportion of samples in their respective datasets.

Table 5: Default hyper-parameters used in our experiments.

Method	Source of Code	Hyper-Parameters	Value
MTFL	[11]	optimizer	customized
		batch size	64
		learning rate	0.01
		local epoch	1
		communicaion round	100
		server_lr	0.01
		bn_private	usyb
		$\beta_1$	0.9
$\beta_2$	0.999		
$C$	0.5		
kNN-Per	[12]	optimizer	Adam
		batch size	64
		learning rate	0.01
		local epoch	1
		communicaion round	100
		aggregator_type	centralized
client_type	KNNPerClient		
SCDPFL	[13]	optimizer	Adam
		batch size	64
		learning rate	0.01
		local epoch	2
		communicaion round	100
		$\lambda_l$	0.4
$\lambda_g$	0.3		
FedKD	[14]	optimizer	Adam
		batch size	64
		learning rate	0.01
		local epoch	1
		communicaion round	100
		tmax	0.98
tmin	0.95		
FedCache	[15]	optimizer	Adam
		batch size	64
		learning rate	0.01
		local epoch	1
		communicaion round	100
		$\beta$	1.5
$R$	16		
FedCache 2.0	Our Implementation	optimizer	Adam
		batch size	64
		learning rate	0.01
		local epoch	5
		communicaion round	15
		distillation learning rate	0.001
		$\tau$	0.5

all clients employ ResNet-L. For image recognition experiments with heterogeneous models, models on clients are evenly distributed among ResNet-S, ResNet-M, and ResNet-L. Note that for this set of experiments, we only consider FedKD [6] and FedCache [7] as baseline algorithms to compare with. This choice is based on the fact that MTFL [8], kNN-Per [9], and SCDPFL [10] support only homogeneous models across clients. In addition, ResNet-T is adopted to facilitate the interaction of model parameters between clients and the server within the FedKD algorithm in all image recognition experiments. For audio understanding on UrbanSound8K [3] and mobile sensor data mining on TMD [4], we exclusively employ the model-homogeneous setting, with all clients deploying a uniform FCN model, whose structures are denoted as FCN-U and FCN-T, respectively.



**Data Partition.** For all experiments conducted in this paper, we utilize the data partition strategy provided by FedML [16] to simulate  $K = 100$  decentralized datasets for clients. We adopt the hyper-parameter  $\alpha \in \{0.5, 2.0\}$  to control the degree of data heterogeneity. A smaller number of  $\alpha$  results in a greater degree of heterogeneity among clients. Notably, the training and testing datasets for the same client have identical distributions, whereas different clients typically have different data distributions, as illustrated in Figure 6.

**Hyper-parameter Settings.** We provide a default setting in Table 5, which is implemented in all experiments unless stated otherwise. Note that the table only showcases a subset of hyperparameters for baseline algorithms; those not mentioned retain their original settings as specified in the corresponding open-source code. Exclusively, we uniformly set the learning rate to 0.1 and the communication round of kNN-Per to 200 for experiments on mobile sensor data mining.

## E Communication Cost Calculation

In this section, introduce how communication cost is computed in our paper. We quantify the communication cost of all considered FL algorithms in terms of pure information transmission—specifically model weights, logits, sample index, and distilled data—between clients and the server. Our communication calculation methodology leverages standard units of bytes to measure communication costs, ensuring precise and scalable metrics. For a comprehensive evaluation, we compute the communication cost of all considered algorithms where the overheads vary based on the type and frequency of transmitted information:

**MTFL.** Both model and optimizer parameters are serialized and transmitted in each communication round. All parameters are encoded as tensors in the float format, with each element occupying 4 bytes.

**kNN-Per and SCDPFL.** Similar to MTFL, these methods involve transmitting model parameters in float tensors in each communication round.

**FedKD.** Parameters of the student model (ResNet-T) are transmitted in each round.

**FedCache.** This method introduces additional complexity by transmitting sample hashes (in float format), sample index (in integer format), and logits (in float format).

**FedCache 2.0.** This method extends FedCache by incorporating distilled data, which is uploaded and downloaded each round. Each client uploads one synthetic data sample per class, with the volume of downloaded data regulated by the hyper-parameter  $\tau$ . Distilled images are initially processed into a

Table 6: Communication cost and efficiency speed-up ratio in image recognition task under two degrees of data heterogeneity with experiments on homogeneous models. The communication cost is measured when the average UA reaches the given threshold. Some methods fail to achieve the average UA threshold, and their communication costs are denoted as N/A. The same as below.

	<b>Method</b>	<b>CIFAR10/45%</b>	<b>CINIC10/40%</b>	<b>CIFAR100/30%</b>
$\alpha = 0.5$	MTFL	N/A	N/A	N/A
	kNN-Per	N/A	N/A	N/A
	SCDPFL	17.4G ( $\times 1.0$ )	7.8G ( $\times 1.0$ )	17.6G ( $\times 1.0$ )
	FedKD	N/A	N/A	N/A
	FedCache	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>389.1M (<math>\times 45.8</math>)</b>	<b>193.8M (<math>\times 41.2</math>)</b>	<b>609.3M (<math>\times 29.6</math>)</b>
	<b>Method</b>	<b>CIFAR10/30%</b>	<b>CINIC10/30%</b>	<b>CIFAR100/15%</b>
$\alpha = 2.0$	MTFL	N/A	39.9G ( $\times 1.0$ )	64.5G ( $\times 1.0$ )
	kNN-Per	12.1G ( $\times 1.6$ )	N/A	17.6G ( $\times 3.7$ )
	SCDPFL	19.4G ( $\times 1.0$ )	10.6G ( $\times 3.8$ )	15.9G ( $\times 4.1$ )
	FedKD	N/A	N/A	N/A
	FedCache	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>315.9M (<math>\times 62.9</math>)</b>	<b>473.5M (<math>\times 86.3</math>)</b>	<b>197.5M (<math>\times 334.4</math>)</b>

Table 7: Average UA on audio understanding with two degrees of data heterogeneity.

Method	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$
MTFL	56.5	46.9
kNN-Per	54.3	54.1
<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>64.8</b>

Table 8: Average UA on mobile sensor data mining with two degrees of data heterogeneity.

Method	$\alpha = 0.5$	$\alpha = 2.0$
MTFL	54.8	46.5
kNN-Per	61.6	48.6
<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>61.7</b>

Table 9: Communication cost and efficiency speed-up ratio in audio understanding task under two degrees of data heterogeneity.

Method	$\alpha = 0.5/50\%$	$\alpha = 2.0/45\%$
MTFL	13.0G ( $\times 1.0$ )	18.4G ( $\times 1.0$ )
kNN-Per	7.5G ( $\times 1.73$ )	7.2G ( $\times 2.6$ )
<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>14.3M (<math>\times 930.9</math>)</b>	<b>19.1M (<math>\times 986.5</math>)</b>

Table 10: Communication cost and efficiency speed-up ratio in mobile sensor data mining task under two degrees of data heterogeneity.

Method	$\alpha = 0.5/50\%$	$\alpha = 2.0/45\%$
MTFL	20.5G ( $\times 1.0$ )	11.9G ( $\times 1.0$ )
kNN-Per	12.4G ( $\times 1.7$ )	11.0G ( $\times 1.1$ )
<b>FedCache 2.0</b>	<b>14.8M (<math>\times 1418.4</math>)</b>	<b>15.4M (<math>\times 791.3</math>)</b>

$32 \times 32 \times 3$  array in uint8 format (1 byte each) before conversion to JPG, optimizing communication cost.

## F Quantitative Communication Information for Image Recognition

In this section, we provide detailed quantitative communication information for all considered FL algorithms in image recognition tasks with homogeneous models. We measure the communication cost in terms of the amount of information transmitted between clients and the server until the average User model Accuracy (UA) reaches a specified threshold. We also provide the communication efficiency speed-up ratio, which compares the communication cost of each method to that of the least efficient baseline method achieving the same threshold precision. Table F quantitates the corresponding efficiency of FedCache 2.0 compared with baseline algorithms. It is evident that FedCache 2.0 significantly reduces the communication cost compared to other state-of-the-art methods, with 28.6 to 332.4 communication efficiency improvements compared with state-of-the-art methods.

## G Results on Additional Application Tasks

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of FedCache 2.0 across additional application tasks, specifically focusing on audio understanding and mobile sensor data mining. These tasks are critical for various real-world edge applications and offer broader evaluations of FedCache 2.0 across diverse data modalities.

### G.1 Evaluation on Audio Understanding

Table 7 presents the average UA on UrbanSound8K dataset under two degrees of data heterogeneity. As observed, FedCache 2.0 consistently outperforms the baseline methods, achieving higher UA across both settings. Additional experimental results on communication efficiency are provided in Table 9 and Figure 7, demonstrating significant reductions in communication cost while maintaining superior performance.




Figure 7: Average UA per unit of communication cost over audio understanding task.




Figure 8: Average UA per unit of communication cost over mobile sensor data mining task.

## G.2 Evaluation on Mobile Sensor Data Mining

Table 8 presents the average UA on TMD dataset under two degrees of data heterogeneity. Results demonstrate that FedCache 2.0 significantly outperforms existing methods under both degrees of data heterogeneity. We also provide qualitative and quantitative evaluation of FedCache 2.0 in Figure 8 and Table 10, respectively, indicating that FedCache 2.0 not only achieves higher system performance but also requires significantly less communication overhead compared to baseline methods.

## References

- [1] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images”. In: (2009).
- [2] Luke N Darlow et al. “Cinic-10 is not imagenet or cifar-10”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.03505* (2018).
- [3] Justin Salamon, Christopher Jacoby, and Juan Pablo Bello. “A dataset and taxonomy for urban sound research”. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2014, pp. 1041–1044.
- [4] Claudia Carpineti et al. “Custom dual transportation mode detection by smartphone devices exploiting sensor diversity”. In: *2018 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops (PerCom Workshops)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 367–372.
- [5] Kaiming He et al. “Deep residual learning for image recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [6] Chuhan Wu et al. “Communication-efficient federated learning via knowledge distillation”. In: *Nature communications* 13.1 (2022), p. 2032.

- [7] Zhiyuan Wu et al. “FedCache: A Knowledge Cache-Driven Federated Learning Architecture for Personalized Edge Intelligence”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* (2024), pp. 1–15. DOI: 10.1109/TMC.2024.3361876.
- [8] Jed Mills, Jia Hu, and Geyong Min. “Multi-Task Federated Learning for Personalised Deep Neural Networks in Edge Computing”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 33.3 (2022), pp. 630–641. DOI: 10.1109/TPDS.2021.3098467.
- [9] Othmane Marfoq et al. “Personalized federated learning through local memorization”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 15070–15092.
- [10] Zihan Chen et al. “Spectral Co-Distillation for Personalized Federated Learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by A. Oh et al. Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023, pp. 8757–8773. URL: [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/file/1b86cf4b15cd83b6520d851eb7298228-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/1b86cf4b15cd83b6520d851eb7298228-Paper-Conference.pdf).
- [11] Jed Mills, Jia Hu, and Geyong Min. <https://github.com/JedMills/MTFL-For-Personalised-DNNs>. 2022.
- [12] Othmane Marfoq et al. <https://github.com/omarfoq/knn-per>. 2022.
- [13] Zihan Chen et al. <https://github.com/jimmyc96/spectral-dis-FL>. 2023.
- [14] Jed Mills, Jia Hu, and Geyong Min. <https://github.com/wuch15/FedKD>. 2022.
- [15] Zhiyuan Wu et al. <https://github.com/wuzhiyuan2000/FedCache>. 2024.
- [16] Chaoyang He et al. “Fedml: A research library and benchmark for federated machine learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13518* (2020).