

# Preliminary Steps Towards Federated Sentiment Classification

Xin-Chun Li, De-Chuan Zhan  
State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology,  
Nanjing University  
lix@lamda.nju.edu.cn, zhandc@nju.edu.cn

Yunfeng Shao, Bingshuai Li, Shaoming Song  
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab  
{shaoyunfeng, libingshuai, shaoming.song}@huawei.com

## ABSTRACT

Automatically mining sentiment tendency contained in natural language is a fundamental research to some artificial intelligent applications, where solutions alternate with challenges. Transfer learning and multi-task learning techniques have been leveraged to mitigate the supervision sparsity and collaborate multiple heterogeneous domains correspondingly. Recent years, the sensitive nature of users' private data raises another challenge for sentiment classification, i.e., data privacy protection. In this paper, we resort to federated learning for multiple domain sentiment classification under the constraint that the corpora must be stored on decentralized devices. In view of the heterogeneous semantics across multiple parties and the peculiarities of word embedding, we pertinently provide corresponding solutions. First, we propose a Knowledge Transfer Enhanced Private-Shared (KTEPS) framework for better model aggregation and personalization in federated sentiment classification. Second, we propose KTEPS\* with the consideration of the rich semantic and huge embedding size properties of word vectors, utilizing Projection-based Dimension Reduction (PDR) methods for privacy protection and efficient transmission simultaneously. We propose two federated sentiment classification scenes based on public benchmarks, and verify the superiorities of our proposed methods with abundant experimental investigations.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Transfer learning**; **Natural language processing**; **Distributed algorithms**.

## KEYWORDS

sentiment classification, federated learning, private-shared, knowledge transfer, word embedding

## ACM Reference Format:

Xin-Chun Li, De-Chuan Zhan and Yunfeng Shao, Bingshuai Li, Shaoming Song. 2021. Preliminary Steps Towards Federated Sentiment Classification. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](https://permissions.acm.org).  
Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.  
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>


## 1 INTRODUCTION

Sentiment Classification (SC) [57] is a fundamental task for capturing and understanding users' emotions in natural language, which has raised pervasive attention and found wide applications. The goal of SC is to identify the overall sentiment polarity of a document, which is a special case of text classification. Researchers have studied various SC settings, such as document-level SC [26, 47], sentence-level SC [1, 2] and aspect-level SC [17, 43], which mainly differ in the granularity of the sentiment. Simultaneously, recent advances in deep neural network (DNN) have facilitated the success of SC, e.g., CNNs [26], RNNs [47], memory networks [18], attention mechanisms [12, 54], transformer [28], etc.

In the history of SC, challenges and solutions are always in alternation. Although DNNs have achieved huge success in SC, they are highly dependent on large annotated corpus. Additionally, the domain shift problem prevents a pre-trained model being directly applied to the target domain. To alleviate the dependence on large amounts of labeled data and mitigate the domain discrepancy, transfer learning (TL) methods are leveraged to provide effective solutions [5, 19, 61]. A further challenge emerges when collaborating multiple corpus, where the semantic contexts vary a lot across domains. To guarantee acceptable performances for each domain, multi-task learning (MTL) techniques are fused into SC [10, 15, 16, 30–34, 60]. Different multiple domain SC (MDSC) methods are proposed to extract domain-invariant knowledge across domains.

This is not an end. Higher requirements for data security [7, 20, 24, 41] poses a new challenge for SC, i.e., data privacy protection. Traditional MDSC methods assume that text data from multiple domains can be shared without any risk of privacy leakage. However, the corpora used to train SC models often contain sensitive information of enterprises or customers in real-world applications, and leaking the private data may lead to responsibilities and risks. *What techniques can we introduce to solve the data privacy challenge? Are there any difficulties that we must overcome?*

In this paper, we resort to federated learning (FL) [27, 35, 53] for privacy-preserved MDSC. FL has been proposed as a natural solution for privacy protection. *Although FL has been applied to some language model applications (e.g., n-gram language model) [13, 14, 35, 41], it has not yet been studied in SC as far as we know.* In fact, the existed methods simply combines FedAvg [35], a classical FL framework, with NLP tasks without pertinent solutions. That is, they aggregate local models to a single global model without consideration of heterogeneous data distributions, i.e., the Non-IID problem [23, 59]. Additionally, word vectors are semantic rich and privacy sensitive representations (e.g., the gender bias) [6, 50], which needs stricter privacy protection mechanisms. Furthermore, the huge embedding size also brings a transmission burden to FL. The whole motivation and the challenges to be solved in this paper are concluded in Figure. 1.



**Figure 1: Illustration of challenges and solutions for Sentiment Classification (SC).** (a) The training procedure of SC. (b) Transfer Learning (TL) methods are utilized to mitigate domain discrepancy and facilitate the low-resource target domain. (c) Multi-Task Learning (MTL) methods are incorporated to collaborate multiple domains. (d) Under the constraints of distributed parties and data privacy, we resort to Federated Learning (FL), where we must overcome two difficulties, i.e., the Non-IID data and Word Embedding problems.

We propose corresponding solutions for both Non-IID and word embedding challenges encountered in federated MDSC (FedMDSC). For Non-IID problems, we first present the correlations between MTL and FL methods when applied to MDSC from the aspect of DNN architecture design, i.e., the private-shared models [3, 8–10, 29, 32, 33, 40]. Then, we propose a Knowledge Transfer Enhanced Private-Shared (KTEPS) framework for consideration of both global model aggregation and local model personalization simultaneously. In detail, local models are designed as DNNs with two parallel branches, where a task-specific classifier is kept private on local devices. A diversity term is added to implicitly separate domain invariant and domain specific information into two branches. To enhance the personalization ability of the private branch, we take advantage of knowledge distillation [22, 58] to facilitate information flow from the global shared branch to the private one. For the word embedding problems, we utilize Projection-based Dimension Reduction (PDR) methods to reduce the size of word embeddings, which can simultaneously provide a stricter privacy protection mechanism and release the burden of communication in FL.

To conclude, our contributions are listed as follows:

- We are the first to investigate the privacy-preserved MDSC as far as we know.
- We are not simply fusing FL into MDSC, and on the contrary, we provide specific solutions to overcome the fundamental difficulties, i.e., the Non-IID and word embedding problems.
- We sort out the relationship between MTL and FL methods from aspect of DNN architecture design, and propose KTEPS for better model aggregation and personalization.
- We utilize PDR methods to compress word embeddings for stricter privacy protection and lighter transmission.
- We construct two FedMDSC scenes based on public SC benchmarks and verify our proposed methods with abundant experimental studies.

## 2 RELATED WORKS

### 2.1 Multi-Domain SC

Multi-Domain SC (MDSC) aims to identify sentiment polarity more precisely with the cooperation of multiple domains. Usually, it attempts to distinguish domain shared and domain specific information instead of simply combining all domains' data. [16] shares the word embedding layer among tasks and assigns a specific output branch to each task. [31] introduces two parallel branches for each individual task, e.g., assigning one separate LSTM layer for each task and meanwhile keeping a shared LSTM layer for all tasks. The illustrations can be found in Figure. 2. Other advanced MDSC methods take advantage of global shared memory [30], private attention [10], or adversarial training [15, 32] mechanisms for MDSC and have also achieved great success.


### 2.2 Federated Learning

Federated Learning (FL) [27, 53] gathers participants in a collaborative system, which is tailored for distributed training with privacy preserved. As categorized in [27], cross-silo and cross-device FL mainly differ in amounts of the participants (e.g., 10 vs.  $10^{10}$ ), communication bottleneck, addressability of clients, etc. The latter one is more relevant to the hardware-level challenges, and we only focus on the cross-silo FL, where small amounts of clients and stable communication can be promised.

Non-IID problem refers to that decentralized samples are typically generated at different contexts, causing challenges to model aggregation and personalization. Various techniques have been proposed to solve the Non-IID problem, e.g., adding regularization term [44], sharing a small public dataset [25, 52], taking a fully decentralized paradigm [4], resorting to meta learning [11], etc.

### 2.3 Aggregation and Personalization

In FL, both of the model aggregation and personalization need to be cared. The former is to generate a global model which is applicable to all participants or can be easily adapted to new scenes [35, 44, 59],



**Figure 2: Illustration of correlations between MTL and FL methods when applied to MDSC. Left: the basic network architecture we utilize for SC. Right: (A) The fully-shared MTL and FedAvg for MDSC. (B) The single branch MTL and FedPer for MDSC. (C) The parallel branch MTL and PFL-DA for MDSC. (D) Inspired of parallel Private-Shared (PS) MTL and Deep Mutual Learning (DML), we propose KTEPS for MDSC.**

while the latter aims to build individual qualified models for each participant [4, 46]. In the IID scenario, participants' data are generated from the same distribution, and a single model can achieve both of these two goals at the same time. However, Non-IID data leads to a dilemma that a single aggregated global model can not simultaneously capture the semantics of all participants.

FedAvg [35] is purely to aggregate a better global model with the collaboration of multiple participants without consideration of personalization. A direct idea to personalize the global aggregated model is finetuning it on the local data with various settings of hyper-parameters [48]. Utilizing fully decentralized learning is natural for better personalization [4], and some meta learning methods have also been investigated [11]. In this paper, we search solutions for considering these two goals simultaneously from the aspect of DNN architecture design, i.e., the private-shared models.

## 2.4 Private-Shared Models

Private-Shared (PS) models aim to divide private and shared information among domains via feeding data to different network components. [8] designs a separation framework for domain adaptation with shared and private encoders. As aforementioned, [16, 31] take single branch and parallel branches for MDSC respectively.

PS models have also been applied to solve Non-IID problem in FL. FedPer [3] shares encoder among clients and keeps private classifier for each client for better personalization, expecting the private classifier can capture task-specific knowledge. PFL-DA [40] keeps an entire model private for each client and shares another

model for global aggregation among clients. FURL [9] keeps the user embedding component private. LG-FedAvg [29] keeps encoder private for each client and shares a global classifier for the heterogeneous multi-modal data. We provide corresponding correlation analysis between MTL and FL methods when applied to MDSC as illustrated in Figure. 2 and propose KTEPS for FedMDSC.


## 2.5 Word Embedding

Recent advances represent words as distributed continuous vectors, which can geometrically capture the linguistic regularities and boost the performance of downstream tasks. Although the obtained success, some drawbacks of word embedding have emerged, e.g., implicit bias and huge embedding size. [6, 50] analyzes the gender bias contained in learned word embeddings and propose methods to remove the sensitive information. [42] utilizes the post-processing method to reduce embedding dimensions, while [37, 45] compress word embeddings via distillation. When applied to FL, these problems can lead to acute privacy and transmission problem, and we propose to reduce the dimension of word embeddings via PDR to tackle these challenges.

## 3 FEDERATED SENTIMENT CLASSIFICATION

### 3.1 Basic Settings

We limit the scope of our research: *we focus on cross-silo federated document-level sentiment classification, and the basic neural network we utilize is a simple "Embedding-BiRNN-MLP" architecture*



**Figure 3: Illustration of our proposed methods. The top shows the DNN architecture in the KTEPS for FedMDSC. “Proj” refers to a projection layer. The bottom shows the upload and download process with PDR in KTEPS\*.**

as shown in Figure 2. Considering other SC paradigms (e.g., aspect-level SC [17, 43]), more complex networks (e.g., transformer [28]), or cross-device FL (e.g., millions of clients) are future works.

The used simple “Embedding-BiRNN-MLP” architecture contains three components, i.e., the word embedding layer, bi-directional rnn (BiRNN) layer and mlp layer, which are abstracted into word embedding (WE), encoder (E), classifier (C) respectively. The word embedding layer maps discrete word indexes to continuous vectors, which are sequentially processed by the BiRNN, and finally the mlp layer predicts the overall sentiment polarity.

### 3.2 Basic Notations

Suppose we have  $K$  participants, and each one has a corpus containing  $N^k$  training reviews and  $M^k$  test reviews. The total number of training samples in the system is  $N = \sum_{k=1}^K N^k$ . The reviews are first processed to be sequences of word indexes, and the generated training data and test data of the  $k$ -th client are  $\left\{ \left( \mathbf{x}_i^k, y_i^k \right) \right\}_{i=1}^{N^k}$  and  $\left\{ \left( \mathbf{x}_i^k, y_i^k \right) \right\}_{i=N^k+1}^{N^k+M^k}$  respectively, where  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{R}^L$  is a list of word indexes with a maximum length of  $L$  and each  $y_i^k \in \{0, 1\}^C$  is a one-hot label vector.

We denote the three components in “Embedding-BiRNN-MLP” architecture as three functions, i.e.,  $E(\cdot)$ ,  $H(\cdot)$ ,  $G(\cdot)$ , whose parameters are  $\theta_E, \theta_H, \theta_G$  respectively. Specially, the parameters of word embedding layer is denoted as  $\theta_E \in \mathcal{R}^{V \times d}$ , where  $V$  is the length of the vocabulary, and  $d$  is the dimension of word embeddings. Without more explanation, we use the superscript “ $k$ ” for the index of

client and subscript “ $i$ ” for samples. In MTL or FL for MDSC, symbols without superscript “ $k$ ” denote the (global) shared ones. The subscript “ $s$ ” and “ $p$ ” represent “shared” and “private” respectively.

We denote  $\text{Softmax}_T(\mathbf{g})_c = \exp(\mathbf{g}_c/T) / \sum_{c'} \exp(\mathbf{g}_{c'}/T)$  as the softmax function, where  $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{R}^C$  is the predicted “logits”, the subscript “ $c$ ” implies the class index and  $T$  is the temperature. Other specific notations will be introduced later.

### 3.3 FL for MDSC

We first introduce how to apply the most classical FL method (i.e., FedAvg [35]) to FedMDSC. For the  $k$ -th client, it first downloads the global model from the parameter server, i.e.,  $\theta_E^k \leftarrow \theta_E, \theta_H^k \leftarrow \theta_H, \theta_G^k \leftarrow \theta_G$ , where  $\theta_E, \theta_H, \theta_G$  are the global parameters of the three components respectively. Then, it finetunes the model on local data. Take the sample  $(\mathbf{x}_i^k, y_i^k)$  as an example:

$$\mathbf{e}_i^k = E(\mathbf{x}_i^k; \theta_E^k), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_i^k = H(\mathbf{e}_i^k; \theta_H^k), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{o}_i^k = \text{SeqMean}(\mathbf{h}_i^k), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_i^k = G(\mathbf{o}_i^k; \theta_G^k), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_i^k = - \sum_{c=1}^C y_{i,c}^k \log \left( \text{Softmax}_1(\mathbf{g}_i^k)_c \right). \quad (5)$$

Equation. 1 obtains the word representations  $\mathbf{e}_i^k \in \mathcal{R}^{d \times L}$  through a lookup operation; Equation. 2 utilizes the BiRNN to process the representations and outputs the hidden representations  $\mathbf{h}_i^k \in \mathcal{R}^{2s \times L}$ , where  $s$  is the hidden size of the recurrent unit; Equation. 3 takes the average of the hidden representations along the sequential dimension as input and outputs  $\mathbf{o}_i^k \in \mathcal{R}^{2s}$ ; Equation. 4 predicts the classification result through a mlp layer and  $\mathbf{g}_i^k \in \mathcal{R}^C$  is the obtained “logits” without softmax operator. Finally, we calculate the cross-entropy loss as in Equation. 5.

Each client finetunes the global model on its local data for some steps and then sends the updated parameters to the parameter server. The server takes a simple model averaging process for these parameters as  $\theta_E = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \theta_E^k, \theta_H = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \theta_H^k, \theta_G = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \theta_G^k$ .

The local training procedure and the global aggregation procedure will be repeated several rounds until convergence.

**REMARK 1.** In FedAvg, the data privacy can be protected owing to the fact that only models are transmitted between clients and the parameter server without explicitly sharing users’ data. Simultaneously, some other advanced methods (e.g., differential privacy [20]) can be further applied to obtain stricter privacy protection requirements, which will be discussed later.

### 3.4 Correlations Between MTL and FL

The easiest way to collaborate multiple domains is utilizing a fully-shared network, and training it on all domains’ data. Similarly, in FL, FedAvg [35] aims to aggregate a single global model, which is shown in Figure. 2 (A). Considering PS models in MTL and FL, the single branch MTL [16] corresponds to the FedPer [3], while

the parallel branch MTL [31] corresponds to the PFL-DA [40] as shown in Figure. 2 (B) and (C) respectively. It is notable that FedPer is purely designed for better personalization and it can not generate a complete global model owing to the single branch architecture.

The correlations between MTL and FL when applied to MDSC are obvious. MTL methods divide the whole network into shared and private components according to whether a component serves all tasks or an individual task. *Tasks in MTL are equivalent to clients in FL, and the shared components in MTL can be adapted to FL as the globally shared ones which participates in the global model aggregation procedure, while the private ones are kept and updated individually on local clients.* Hence, the well-performed MTL methods can be adapted to FL. For example, [12] utilizes user and product embedding for better capturing specific information, which can be generalized to privatize the user representation layer on local clients [9].

**REMARK 2.** *Aside from the number of branches, the shared components are also different in Figure. 2 (B) and (C). For example, should we keep a private word embedding layer or BiRNN for each client? We will discuss this in experimental ablation studies.*

## 4 PROPOSED METHODS

### 4.1 Solution to Non-IID Problem: KTEPS

Our goal is to obtain better aggregation and personalization simultaneously even in a Non-IID scene. As aforementioned, FL methods based on single branch networks, e.g., FedPer [3] and LG-FedAvg [29], can not generate a complete model for novel scenes. Hence, we follow FL methods with parallel architectures, e.g., PFL-DA [40].

Specifically, we divide the network into several components: global shared word embedding  $E_s(\cdot)$ , global shared BiRNN  $H_s(\cdot)$ , global shared mlp classifier  $G_s(\cdot)$ , local private mlp classifier  $G_p(\cdot)$ . The parameters of these components are  $\theta_{E_s}$ ,  $\theta_{H_s}$ ,  $\theta_{G_s}$ , and  $\theta_{G_p}$  respectively. The illustration can be found in the top of Figure. 3. Notably, PFL-DA [40] utilizes a complete private model which may overfit on a small local dataset, while we only privatize a single mlp classification layer, which is introduced in Remark. 2 and will be investigated in Section. 5.6.4.

Although with the parallel PS architecture, two questions are still naturally asked: (1) *How to guarantee that the global shared components can capture client invariant information while the local private ones capture client specific information? Is this PS architecture design enough?* (2) *How to mitigate the feature mismatch occurring between the newly-downloaded BiRNN and the locally-preserved mlp classification layer?*

**4.1.1 Diversity.** The first question has been investigated in ASP-MTL [32], which proposes to extract domain invariant information with the help of domain adversarial training. However, training a domain discriminator is not an easy task in FL, unless the data features from different domains can be sent out and located in the same device as done in [39]. We regard that feature sharing will violate the privacy protection constraint. Hence, we relax the requirement of explicitly extracting domain invariant features and only increase the diversity of shared and private classifiers.

Specifically, for the  $k$ -th client, we project the outputs of the BiRNN, i.e.,  $o_i^k$  calculated as in Equation. 1 to Equation. 3, into two different subspaces as shown in top part of Figure. 3. Mathematically, the projected features for the  $i$ -th sample  $\mathbf{x}_i^k$  are obtained as:

$$o_{s,i}^k = P_s(o_i^k; \theta_{P_s}^k), \quad o_{p,i}^k = P_p(o_i^k; \theta_{P_p}^k), \quad (6)$$

where  $P_s(\cdot)$  and  $P_p(\cdot)$  are functions of the shared and private projection layers, and  $o_{s,i}^k$  and  $o_{p,i}^k$  are the projected shared and private features respectively.  $\theta_{P_s}^k$  and  $\theta_{P_p}^k$  are parameters of the two projection layers.

To increase the diversity of projected features, we utilize Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion (HSIC) [21] as a regularization. We adapt the definition of HSIC to our problem as follows:

**DEFINITION 1.** (Empirical HSIC) Let  $\left\{ \left( o_{s,i}^k, o_{p,i}^k \right) \right\}_{i=1}^B$  be a series of  $B$  independent observations. An empirical estimation of HSIC is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}^k := (B-1)^{-2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{L}_* \mathbf{H} \mathbf{L}_p \mathbf{H}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{L}_* \in \mathcal{R}^{B \times B}$  is the gram matrix defined as  $\mathbf{L}_{*,ij} := l_*(o_{s,i}^k, o_{s,j}^k)$ ,  $* \in \{s, p\}$ .  $l_*$  is a kernel function and  $\mathbf{H}_{ij} = \mathcal{I}\{i=j\} - 1/B$ .

For implementation, we utilize single-layer fully-connected projection mlps with the output's size being the same of the input.

**4.1.2 Knowledge Transfer.** For answering the second question, we propose to enhance the information flow from the shared branch to the private one. PFL-DA [40] only takes a weighted combination strategy to train both branches, which is far from the goal of knowledge transfer. One method to explicitly transfer knowledge is distillation [22], in which a teacher network can guide the learning process of a student network. Recently, a learning paradigm named Deep Mutual Learning (DML) [58] finds that two networks can co-teach each other simultaneously even they have not yet converged. Inspired of this, we take advantage of DML to enhance the ability of the private classifier.

In detail, we denote the predicted "logits" of the two branches as  $\mathbf{g}_{s,i}^k \in \mathcal{R}^C$  and  $\mathbf{g}_{p,i}^k \in \mathcal{R}^C$ , and the knowledge transfer loss can be formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{i,\text{kt}}^k = - \sum_{c=1}^C \text{Softmax}_1(\mathbf{g}_{p,i}^k)_c \log(\text{Softmax}_T(\mathbf{g}_{s,i}^k)_c), \quad (8)$$

where  $T$  is the temperature and we stop the gradients of the  $\mathbf{g}_s^k$  in code implementation.

In total, the loss function of a local data batch  $\left\{ (\mathbf{x}_i^k, y_i^k) \right\}_{i=1}^B$  is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}}^k = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \left( \mathcal{L}_{s,i}^k + \mathcal{L}_{p,i}^k + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{i,\text{kt}}^k \right) + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{div}}^k, \quad (9)$$

where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are pre-defined coefficients.  $\mathcal{L}_{s,i}^k$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{p,i}^k$  are cross-entropy losses calculated similarly as in Equation. 5. The coefficients of these two terms will be investigated in Section. 5.6.1.

## 4.2 Solution to Word Embedding Problem: PDR and KTEPS\*

As aforementioned, word vectors are semantic rich representations which are vulnerable to attacks. For example, as categorized in [27], the server can be an honest-but-curious one that can inspect private information through word relationships, e.g., mining the users' jobs or genders through inner product similarities [6]. Furthermore, the huge word embedding size burdens the transmission a lot. For solving the privacy problem, [49] designs a suite of arithmetic primitives on encrypted word embeddings. However, it is only applicable to the simple CBOW or Skip-gram [36] algorithms and the arithmetic operations are too complex. Hence, we only follow the advocated goals of [49], i.e., security, effectiveness, and efficiency. *To summarize, the targeted word embeddings should be hard to inspect without degrading the final model's performance a lot, and the computation should be practically acceptable.*

We resort to PDR methods to achieve the above goals simultaneously. Specifically, we utilize PCA to compress word embeddings as done in [38, 42, 51]. We denote the local word embedding matrix as  $\theta_E^k \in \mathcal{R}^{V \times d}$ , and we apply PCA to it:

$$\{\mathbf{u}_1^k, \mathbf{u}_2^k, \dots, \mathbf{u}_d^k\} = \text{PCA}(\theta_E^k), \quad (10)$$

where  $\{\mathbf{u}_i^k \in \mathcal{R}^d\}_{i=1}^d$  are principal components sorted by eigenvalues. A normal method is to select the top  $d_2$  ones to compose the projection subspace. However, the post-processing method [38] find that the most of the energy is located in about the top 8 dimensions, and eliminating them can remove the same dominating directions and lead to better performances. Hence, we propose to select the intermediate components  $\{\mathbf{u}_{d_1}^k, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{d_2}^k\}$  to form the projection matrix  $\mathbf{U}^k \in \mathcal{R}^{d \times (d_2 - d_1 + 1)}$ , where  $1 \leq d_1 < d_2 \leq d$ . The compressed word embedding matrix is:

$$\hat{\theta}_E^k = \theta_E^k \mathbf{U}^k. \quad (11)$$

For transmission, we first add noise to both the projection matrix  $\mathbf{U}^k$  and the compressed word embedding matrix  $\hat{\theta}_E^k$ , and then send them to the parameter server. Before aggregation, the server will first decompress  $\hat{\theta}_E^k$  as follows:

$$\bar{\theta}_E^k = \hat{\theta}_E^k \mathbf{U}^{kT}, \quad (12)$$

where we omit the formulation of adding noise.

**4.2.1 Security.** In summary, we add three strategies towards the privacy protection:

- FL is utilized to keep data preserved on local clients without directly transmission.
- Noise is added to model parameters to satisfy differential privacy [20] as much as possible.
- Projection based compression can eliminate both dominating directions and subtle information of word embeddings.

We give a detailed analysis for the last one. For a specific word vector  $\mathbf{v}^k$ , the server can only restore it as  $\bar{\mathbf{v}}^k = \sum_{i=d_1}^{d_2} (\mathbf{v}^{kT} \mathbf{u}_i^k) \mathbf{u}_i^k$ . On one hand, with larger  $d_1$  and smaller  $d_2$ , it is harder for the server to restore the raw word vectors. On the other hand, the word

relationships can be disturbed owing to the fact that:

$$\{\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_1}^k\}^T \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_2}^k \leq \{\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_1}^k\}^T \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{j_3}^k \Rightarrow \{\mathbf{v}_{j_1}^k\}^T \mathbf{v}_{j_2}^k \leq \{\mathbf{v}_{j_1}^k\}^T \mathbf{v}_{j_3}^k, \quad (13)$$

which can be experimentally proved via the observation that a word pair with larger inner product value can still be larger or become smaller compared with another pair after the embedding compression. The fact implies that the risk of privacy leakage through mining word relationships is decreased, which provides a stricter data privacy protection mechanism.

**4.2.2 Effectiveness.** The energy kept is  $\sum_{i=d_1}^{d_2} \lambda_i / \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i$  after the compression, where  $\lambda_i$  is the  $i$ -th singular value of the word embedding matrix. The energy kept and the information removed need to be balanced. In implementations, we find that when  $d = 200$ , setting  $d_1 = 2$  and  $d_2 = 150$  is a good choice. We will investigate the various settings in Section. 5.6.3. Additionally, the transmission cost for uploading word embedding has been decreased from  $O(V \times d)$  to  $O((V + d) \times (d_2 - d_1 + 1))$ .

**4.2.3 Efficiency.** The PCA algorithm includes computing covariance matrix and applying SVD steps, whose time complexity are  $O(V \times d^2)$  and  $O(d^3)$  respectively. When compared to the complex neural network training process, this is efficient enough.

**REMARK 3.** For the  $k$ -th client, only the vectors of the local vocabulary  $\mathcal{V}^k \subset \mathcal{V}$  can be updated. Hence, we can only download the corresponding word embedding subset from the server and utilize the above PDR method to the subset, further decreasing the uploading transmission cost to  $O((V^k + d) \times (d_2 - d_1 + 1))$  and the computing cost to  $O(V^k \times d^2 + d^3)$ .

Overall, the whole procedure of KTEPS\* for FedMDSC can be found in Algorithm. 1. Notably, KTEPS does not apply the PDR process as in Line. 13 and Line. 17.

---

### Algorithm 1 KTEPS\*

---

```

1: for Each Global Round do
2:   procedure UPDATELOCALDEVICE( $k$ )   ▶ Update  $k$ -th local model
3:      $\theta_{Es}^k \leftarrow \theta_{Es}$                  ▶ Download global shared word embedding
4:      $\theta_{Hs}^k \leftarrow \theta_{Hs}$                  ▶ Download global shared BiRNN
5:      $\theta_{Ps}^k \leftarrow \theta_{Ps}$                  ▶ Download global shared projection layer
6:      $\theta_{Gs}^k \leftarrow \theta_{Gs}$                  ▶ Download global shared mlp classifier
7:   for Each Local Epoch do
8:     for Each Data Batch  $\{(\mathbf{x}_i^k, \mathbf{y}_i^k)\}_{i=1}^B$  do
9:       Calculate loss as in Equation. 9
10:      Update  $\theta_{Es}^k, \theta_{Hs}^k, \theta_{Ps}^k, \theta_{Gs}^k$  and  $\theta_{Pp}^k, \theta_{Gp}^k$ 
11:    end for
12:  end for
13:  Compress  $\theta_{Es}^k$  as in Equation. 10 and 11, get  $\hat{\theta}_{Es}^k$  and  $\mathbf{U}^k$ 
14:  Add noise to  $\hat{\theta}_{Es}^k, \mathbf{U}^k, \theta_{Hs}^k, \theta_{Ps}^k, \theta_{Gs}^k$  and send them to server
15: end procedure
16: procedure UPDATEGLOBALSERVER   ▶ Update global model
17:   Decompress  $\hat{\theta}_{Es}^k$  as in Equation. 12, get  $\bar{\theta}_{Es}^k$ 
18:    $\theta_{Es} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \bar{\theta}_{Es}^k, \theta_{Hs} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \theta_{Hs}^k, \theta_{Ps} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \theta_{Ps}^k, \theta_{Gs} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N^k}{N} \theta_{Gs}^k$  ▶ Parameter aggregation
19: end procedure
20: end for

```

---



**Table 1: The statistical information of the FDU and IYY scene.**

Scene	Client	$N^k$	$M^k$	Avg.L	$V^k$	C
FDU	Apparel	1600	400	71	7K	2
	Baby	1500	400	125	8K	2
	Books	1600	400	190	22K	2
	Camera	1597	400	146	10K	2
	DVD	1600	400	208	21K	2
	Elec.	1598	400	124	9K	2
	Health	1600	400	99	8K	2
	Kitchen	1600	400	104	8K	2
	Mag.	1570	400	135	11K	2
	Music	1600	400	157	14K	2
	Soft.	1515	400	156	9K	2
	Sports	1599	400	114	9K	2
	Toys	1600	400	108	9K	2
	Video	1600	400	173	17K	2
IYY	Imdb	1600	400	312	21K	2
	MR	1600	400	23	7K	2
	Imdb	67426	9112	409	44K	5
	Yelp13	62522	8671	199	38K	5
	Yelp14	183019	25399	207	43K	5

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

### 5.1 Datasets and Preprocessing Details

We construct two FedMDSC scenes, i.e., **FDU** and **IYY**. FDU<sup>1</sup> contains 16 SC tasks, which is originally proposed to verify the ASP method [32]. We distribute the 16 tasks onto 16 clients. Each client in FDU does a 2-class SC task. IYY contains only 3 clients, which is constructed by three common SC benchmarks, i.e., IMDB, Yelp13, Yelp14<sup>2</sup>. Both Yelp13 and Yelp14 contain 5 sentiment levels, while IMDB has 10 levels. For consistency, we discretize the 10 sentiment levels in IMDB into 5 levels by merging two successive levels. In FDU and IYY, each client has a local train and test set. We do not use validation sets, and the used evaluation criterions will be introduced in Section. 5.3.

We utilize the word segmentations provided in the downloaded corpus and only split reviews via space. We count the word occurrences for each client individually and then aggregate them on the parameter server. We select the most 50000 frequent ones as the global vocab  $\mathcal{V}$  for both FDU and IYY. We clip or pad the reviews to have the maximum length 200 for FDU and 400 for IYY. Additionally, we add “<unk>” to denote the words that are not in the vocab and “<pad>” to denote the padded words. The statistical information of the two scenes can be found in Table. 1.

### 5.2 Network and Hyper-parameters

We utilize the aforementioned “Embedding-BiRNN-MLP” as the base model. Specifically, we set the word embedding size as 200 and initialize it with Glove<sup>3</sup>. We utilize BiGRU with a hidden size of

64 as BiRNN, and a two layer fully connected network with ReLU activation for classification.

We use SGD with a momentum of 0.9 as the optimizer. We set LR=0.01 for FDU and set LR=0.1 for IYY. Additionally, we find that setting the LR of the embedding layer in IYY to be 0.01 can be better. We set the batch size of FDU and IYY to be 8 and 64 correspondingly. For FL methods, we set the number of local epoches to be 2 and the global aggregation round is iterated 50 and 20 times for FDU and IYY respectively. We add gaussian noise with  $\sigma = 0.01$  to the model parameters independently. For KTEPS, we utilize gaussian kernel function in Equation. 7,  $T = 0.25$  in Equation. 8 and set  $\lambda_1 = 0.01, \lambda_2 = 0.01$  in Equation. 9. For KTEPS\*, we set  $d_1 = 2$  to remove the largest principal component of word embeddings and  $d_2 = 150$  to reduce the communication cost. For other hyper-parameters in compared methods, we utilize the settings reported in corresponding papers.

### 5.3 Evaluation Metric

For evaluation of global model aggregation, we calculate the global model’s accuracy on all participants’ test data:

$$Ag^k = \frac{1}{M^k} \sum_{i=N^k+1}^{N^k+M^k} \mathcal{I} \left\{ \arg \max g_i^k = \arg \max y_i^k \right\}, \quad (14)$$

$$Ag = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{K} Ag^k, \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}\{\cdot\}$  is the indication function.  $Ag^k$  is the accuracy for the  $k$ -th client and  $Ag$  is the averaged result.

For evaluation of model personalization, we take a different but similar metric as in [48]. Upon the aggregation stage converges, we finetune the global model on local clients’ training data for  $Z$  steps and test the model on the local test data every  $z$  steps. We set  $Z = n_Z \times z$ , and a group of test accuracies can be recorded as  $\{Ap_t^k\}_{t=1}^{n_Z}$ . We denote the personalization ability as:

$$Ap^k = \sum_{t=1}^{n_Z} \frac{1}{n_Z} Ap_t^k, \quad Ap = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{K} Ap^k, \quad (16)$$

**REMARK 4.** In FedAvg, the  $Ag^k$  is a special case of  $Ap_t^k$  when  $t = 0$ , i.e., no any finetune steps. For  $t > 0$  or other PS frameworks,  $Ag^k$  is evaluated on global aggregated model, while  $Ap^k$  is evaluated on both shared and private components. For KTEPS and KTEPS\*, we average the outputs of private and shared classifiers for calculating  $Ap^k$ , and different inference mechanisms are investigated in Section. 5.6.2.

### 5.4 Compared Methods

We briefly introduce the compared methods as follows:

- **Indiv.** trains model on each client individually.
- **FS** trains model in a fully shared manner without data privacy protection (Figure. 2 (A)).
- **ASP.** [32] utilizes adversarial MTL to separate domain shared and domain specific information without data privacy protection.
- **FedAvg** [35] trains a single model for all clients with data privacy protection (Figure. 2 (A)).

<sup>1</sup><http://nlp.fudan.edu.cn/data/>

<sup>2</sup><http://ir.hit.edu.cn/~dytang/>

<sup>3</sup><http://nlp.stanford.edu/data/glove.6B.zip>

**Table 2: Model aggregation results of our models on FDU and IYY against typical baselines. We list  $Ag^k$  for all clients and report the  $Ag$  in the “Avg” row filled in gray.**

Scene	Client	Indiv.	FS	ASP.	FedAvg	FedFu.	PFL.	FedProx	FedMMD	KTEPS	KTEPS*
FDU	Apparel	83.6	86.4	86.0	86.2	84.1	85.2	86.0	87.6	85.7	84.4
	Baby	81.1	89.0	88.5	85.2	85.4	88.4	87.8	88.1	89.8	85.2
	Books	79.1	82.5	85.4	83.3	82.6	84.6	81.8	84.1	82.7	80.2
	Camera	84.9	85.3	88.8	86.2	82.4	85.4	86.6	85.2	86.6	83.4
	DVD	80.7	84.5	86.2	87.5	85.8	85.4	83.6	84.9	86.3	81.0
	Elec.	80.1	85.2	85.4	86.1	84.1	84.1	84.0	84.9	84.2	85.2
	Health	79.8	89.0	90.2	87.6	86.0	88.0	87.9	88.5	89.2	86.5
	Kitchen	79.8	86.8	87.9	86.1	86.8	88.2	87.2	88.8	87.7	86.9
	Mag.	89.6	87.7	87.5	87.8	85.6	87.6	84.8	86.1	85.7	85.6
	Music	76.6	82.7	82.2	85.7	79.8	81.8	80.8	80.4	83.3	79.9
	Soft.	85.0	89.4	87.4	86.6	85.9	86.8	87.2	88.0	88.9	85.1
	Sports	82.1	84.3	86.9	84.9	84.5	85.4	86.4	84.0	85.6	83.5
	Toys	83.3	89.9	89.6	86.2	86.2	88.8	86.6	88.9	88.2	90.6
	Video	82.8	88.1	86.2	87.1	85.9	87.2	85.4	86.0	87.6	83.5
	Imdb	77.2	83.1	82.9	85.3	82.8	82.8	82.5	83.5	84.0	79.4
	MR	72.4	75.8	74.4	69.2	73.4	74.8	74.4	74.8	75.3	65.9
	Avg	81.1	85.6	86.0	85.1	83.8	85.3	84.6	85.2	85.7	82.9
IYY	Imdb	55.3	55.7	56.7	54.6	53.7	53.6	56.6	53.4	55.6	54.9
	Yelp13	61.8	62.6	63.8	62.4	61.6	61.5	61.0	59.4	62.9	62.3
	Yelp14	59.7	60.1	61.0	60.1	59.3	59.4	59.3	57.1	60.7	60.0
	Avg	58.9	59.5	60.5	59.1	58.2	58.2	59.0	56.6	59.7	59.1

**Table 3: Model personalization results of our models on FDU and IYY against typical baselines. We list  $Ap^k$  for all clients and report the  $Ap$  in the “Avg” row filled in gray.**

Scene	Client	Indiv.	FS	ASP.	FedAvg	FedPer	LG.	FedFu.	PFL.	FedProx	FedMMD	KTEPS	KTEPS*
FDU	Apparel	83.6	86.8	86.0	86.6	87.2	80.4	84.2	86.4	86.0	87.4	86.2	85.0
	Baby	81.1	89.1	88.0	86.5	87.6	82.0	85.3	83.9	87.1	88.0	89.8	84.9
	Books	79.1	82.7	84.7	84.7	81.9	81.0	82.2	80.7	84.0	84.2	83.6	80.5
	Camera	84.9	85.5	88.2	85.8	86.3	85.2	85.7	85.2	86.2	85.0	86.8	82.5
	DVD	80.7	84.5	86.2	85.0	83.4	78.3	81.5	81.4	83.8	84.9	86.0	80.8
	Elec.	80.1	85.0	86.3	86.2	84.3	80.5	82.3	79.8	85.6	84.9	84.0	84.0
	Health	79.8	88.6	90.5	89.8	88.0	79.6	84.5	84.3	87.8	88.4	89.8	87.6
	Kitchen	79.8	86.4	87.4	84.0	88.9	80.8	79.8	80.0	87.1	88.5	87.3	86.0
	Mag.	89.6	87.6	87.4	87.5	87.8	91.2	88.5	89.5	85.3	87.9	87.5	86.9
	Music	76.6	82.8	83.1	84.0	80.7	76.9	79.1	79.0	82.1	82.1	82.2	79.0
	Soft.	85.0	90.0	89.0	87.2	88.6	88.5	85.0	81.5	88.5	88.2	88.9	85.5
	Sports	82.1	84.6	85.4	84.2	85.7	81.5	84.8	83.3	84.9	84.0	85.3	83.1
	Toys	83.3	89.8	90.2	88.2	88.0	81.8	83.3	86.2	88.0	89.0	89.0	91.2
	Video	82.8	88.0	86.6	86.7	87.3	84.2	86.4	81.5	85.7	86.3	87.6	84.4
	Imdb	77.2	82.7	82.6	81.8	82.5	78.0	76.5	78.0	82.0	83.9	82.8	79.2
	MR	72.4	76.0	75.2	77.0	75.6	69.3	70.9	72.4	74.9	76.2	75.7	69.7
	Avg	81.1	85.6	86.0	85.3	85.2	81.2	82.5	82.1	84.9	85.6	85.8	83.1
IYY	Imdb	55.3	56.5	56.2	56.0	56.0	60.0	57.8	57.8	57.6	53.7	56.9	55.4
	Yelp13	61.8	63.1	64.1	62.6	62.4	62.0	62.0	61.6	61.4	59.7	63.0	62.8
	Yelp14	59.7	60.2	61.4	60.3	60.1	60.5	60.1	59.8	59.5	57.7	60.9	60.4
	Avg	58.9	59.9	60.6	59.6	59.5	60.8	59.9	59.7	59.5	57.0	60.3	59.6



- **FedPer** [3] takes single branch for each client and keeps only the mlp classifier private (Figure. 2 (B)).
- **FedFusion** [56] fuses the local and global model's features to accelerate FL.
- **LG**. [29] keeps the embedding layer and the BiRNN private, while shares the classifier globally.
- **PFL**. [40] keeps a complete model shared and trains a private model for each client individually (Figure. 2 (C)).
- **FedProx** [44] adds a proximal term to regularize the local update of FedAvg to solve the Non-IID problem.
- **FedMMD** [55] utilizes a MMD based regularization term, making the features of local model similar to the global model.
- **KTEPS** is the proposed method (Figure. 3 top). We add the diversity (Equation. 7) and knowledge transfer (Equation. 8) terms to enhance both of the model aggregation and personalization performances.
- **KTEPS\*** utilizes projection based word embedding compression to KTEPS (Figure. 3 bottom).

Notably, FedPer and LG. can not aggregate a complete global model owing to the single branch architecture, so we do not compare our methods against them in global model aggregation.

## 5.5 Experimental Results


The model aggregation and personalization results are listed in Table. 2 and Table. 3. We list  $Ag^k$  and  $Ap^k$  for all clients and report  $Ag$  and  $Ap$  in the "Avg" row. Indiv. displays the performance lower-bound, while FS simply combines data together and is not a proper upperbound. ASP. obtains best results owing to explicit domain adversarial training. KTEPS can almost get higher performances than FedAvg and FS, while a bit weaker than ASP. as expected. Furthermore, KTEPS can get better results than the compared FL variants. Compared with KTEPS, the performances of KTEPS\* drop a lot, whereas it can still work better than individual training.

From the aspect of clients, we find that some clients will get a performance degradation in MTL or FL. For example, the Mag. in FDU can reach 89.6 in individual training, whereas it can only reach 87.5 and 85.7 in ASP. and KTEPS. Another observation is that Yelp13 and Yelp14 can get higher gains in IYY, while Imdb gets little improvement. These observations are related to task similarities. Mining correlated tasks or detecting outliers are future works.

Additionally, to intuitively display the superiorities of KTEPS, we record the  $Ag$  in each aggregation round and  $Ap_t$  for each  $t$ -th personalization step. We plot  $Ag$  and  $Ap_t$  of FDU in Figure. 4. First, FedPer and LG. obtains  $Ag \approx 0.5$  owing to that they can not obtain complete global models, while the personalization results are normal. Second, the personalization performances of LG., FedFu., and PFL. are lower than other methods because these three methods both keep a word embedding layer private, which causes overfitting. FedMMD can weakly obtain superior results than FedAvg and FedProx, and KTEPS can get best aggregation and personalization results simultaneously.

## 5.6 Ablation Studies

**5.6.1 Loss Terms and Coefficients.** We first study the loss terms in Equation. 9. We set  $\lambda_1 \in \{0.0, 0.001, 0.01\}$ ,  $\lambda_2 \in \{0.0, 0.001, 0.01\}$  and



**Figure 4: Convergence curves of FL methods on FDU. The first 50 steps display the  $Ag$  results and the left 25 steps display  $Ap_t$ .**

**Table 4: Model aggregation and personalization results of our models on FDU and IYY with different loss coefficients.**

Scene	$\lambda_1 \backslash \lambda_2$	Ag			Ap		
		0.0	0.001	0.01	0.0	0.001	0.01
FDU	0.0	85.0	85.4	85.2	85.2	85.5	85.3
	0.001	85.5	85.3	85.1	85.8	85.6	85.3
	0.01	85.2	85.0	85.7	85.3	85.3	85.8
IYY	0.0	58.8	59.0	58.8	59.6	59.6	59.7
	0.001	59.1	59.2	59.1	59.7	59.7	59.8
	0.01	58.5	59.5	59.7	59.7	59.7	60.3

**Table 5: Model personalization results of our models on FDU and IYY with different settings of learning rate multiplier  $\mu$ .**

S.	$\mu$	KTEPS				KTEPS*			
		1.0	0.1	0.01	0.001	1.0	0.1	0.01	0.001
FDU		79.0	85.1	85.8	85.5	77.5	81.1	83.1	83.5
IYY		44.5	58.1	60.3	59.9	40.3	59.1	59.6	59.4

report  $Ag$  and  $Ap$  in Table. 4. Specially, setting  $\lambda_1 = 0.0$  and  $\lambda_2 = 0.0$  is similar to FedAvg, while the network architecture is different. We can find that with  $\lambda_1 > 0.0$  or  $\lambda_2 > 0.0$ , the performances become better. We also use larger  $\lambda_2 = \{0.1, 1.0\}$ , and the performances drop a lot. We analyze the logged loss values and observe that the diversity loss have a higher magnitude. Hence, empirically setting  $\lambda_2 \in [0.001, 0.01]$  will be an appropriate choice.

**5.6.2 Personalization Mechanisms.** For model personalization, setting a smaller LR is very important. We set the personalization LR as  $\mu * LR_{ag,0}$ , where  $LR_{ag,0}$  is the initial LR used in global aggregation stage as aforementioned in Section. 5.2. The  $Ap$  results are listed in Table. 5. If we set  $\mu = 1.0$ , it is too large and the performances drop a lot. A smaller  $\mu \in [0.001, 0.01]$  can lead to better personalization performances.

**Table 6: Model personalization results of our models on FDU and IYY with different local inference mechanisms.**

<div>S. \ IW</div>		KTEPS			KTEPS <sup>★</sup>		
		s	p	sp	s	p	sp
FDU		85.5	85.6	85.8	83.0	83.0	83.1
IYY		60.1	60.2	60.3	59.5	59.6	59.6

**Table 7: Model aggregation and personalization results of our models on FDU and IYY with different  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  settings.**


S.	$d_2$	$d_1$	Ag				Ap			
			1	2	3	6	1	2	3	6
<b>F.</b>	200		85.7	83.7	82.6	50.5	85.8	83.9	83.1	49.2
	150		84.9	82.9	61.6	50.5	85.5	83.1	65.0	49.1
<b>I.</b>	200		59.7	59.0	58.7	58.2	60.3	59.9	59.5	59.2
	150		59.5	59.1	58.8	56.9	60.3	59.6	59.0	58.1

**Table 8: Model aggregation and personalization results of our models on FDU with different architectures and different  $\lambda_1$ .**

$\lambda_1$	Arch.	Ag			Ap		
		A	B	C	A	B	C
0.0		85.0	85.1	85.3	85.6	83.5	82.1
0.001		85.6	85.2	85.1	86.0	83.6	82.8
0.01		85.8	85.5	85.3	85.8	83.3	81.4
0.1		85.9	85.5	85.6	86.0	83.7	82.1

In addition, we find that our proposed methods are invariant to local inference mechanisms, i.e., making predictions via the shared classifier (“s”), private classifier (“p”), or the average of them (“sp”). We report Ap with these three inference ways (“IW”) as in Table. 6. Although “p” and “sp” are weakly better than “s”, the results are almost the same. First, the added knowledge transfer term makes the predictions of private and shared classifier consistent. Second, the private classifier captures domain specific information and can get weakly better personalization results.

**5.6.3 Word Embedding Compression.** The settings of  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  in KTEPS\* are vital to the performances. We set  $d_1 \in \{1, 2, 3, 6\}$  and  $d_2 \in \{200, 150\}$ , where  $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 200$  degenerates into KTEPS. The Ag and Ap results are listed in Table. 7. The performances drop sharply with  $d_1$  becoming larger. This is reasonable because removing the top principal components leads to information loss. However, this is inconsistent with PPA [38], which may owing to that PPA is a post-processing method while KTEPS\* takes an iterated procedure which can raise error accumulation. All in all, we can remove the first component and the subtle 50 dimensions, e.g.,  $d_1 = 2$  and  $d_2 = 150$ , for protecting privacy and reducing transmission cost respectively, and the performances are acceptable. Notably, if we assume the privacy constraint on word embeddings

**Figure 5: Illustration of the privacy protection mechanism in IYY.**

can be relaxed and we only remove the smallest 50 dimensions for releasing the transmission burden, e.g.,  $d_1 = 1$  and  $d_2 = 150$ , the performances can achieve much better results.

We present an empirical explanation for the privacy protection mechanism of KTEPS\* in IYY. We compare the most similar words of “man” in three word embeddings, i.e., the one on client “Yelp13” before compression, the corresponding one that the server restores (Equation. 12), the final aggregated one which will be send to clients. We denote these as “Client”, “Server”, and “Agg” in Figure. 5. We first qualitatively present the most similar words of “man” in the dashed boxes, where we find that setting  $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 150$  can not disturb the word relationships a lot, while setting  $d_1 = 2$  can lead to distinct similar words. For quantitatively analysis, we calculate  $I_{ser}$  as the number of intersected top- $K$  similar words in “Server” and “Client”, and  $I_{ag}$  for “Agg” and “Client”. A smaller  $I_{ser}$  or  $I_{ag}$  implies that the risk of inspecting private information via word relationships by the server or other clients is decreased. The tables in Figure. 5 empirically verify that setting  $d_1 = 2$  can lead to a stricter privacy protection.

**5.6.4 Model Architectures.** Finally, we answer the question that why we only privatize a mlp classifier (Figure. 3) rather than the “BiRNN-MLP” or the whole model. We denote these three architectures (Arch.) as “A”, “B” and “C” respectively. We remove the projection layers and the diversity term (i.e.,  $\lambda_2 = 0.0$ ), and only report the Ag and Ap under different settings of  $\lambda_1$  in Table. 8. Although “B” and “C” can obtain comparable Ag results, the personalization results are worse than “A”. Reasonably, the mlp classifier captures task-specific information and its number of parameters are not too large to overfit. Hence, only privatizing classifier will lead to better results. Additionally, this table also verifies the effectiveness of the added knowledge transfer term.

## 6 CONCLUSION

We carried on a preliminary research to MDSC with data privacy protection. We first sorted out the relationships between MTL and FL from the aspect of private-shared models, and correspondingly proposed a FL framework KTEPS for better model aggregation and personalization simultaneously under the Non-IID scenario.

Additionally, for word embedding problems, we resorted to PDR and introduced KTEPS\* as a solution. Comprehensive experimental studies verified the superiorities of our methods. In summary, our work takes a small step towards FedMDSC. Considering fine-grained SC paradigms, cross-device FL settings, complex networks, task relationships, and advanced embedding compression methods are future works.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Md. Shad Akhtar, Abhishek Kumar, Deepanway Ghosal, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. 2017. A Multilayer Perceptron based Ensemble Technique for Fine-grained Financial Sentiment Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-11, 2017*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 540–546.
- [2] Stefanos Angelidis and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Multiple Instance Learning Networks for Fine-Grained Sentiment Analysis. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics* 6 (2018), 17–31.
- [3] Manoj Ghuman Arivazhagan, Vinay Aggarwal, Aaditya Kumar Singh, and Sunav Choudhary. 2019. Federated Learning with Personalization Layers. *CoRR* abs/1912.00818 (2019).
- [4] Aurélien Bellet, Rachid Guerraoui, Mahsa Taziki, and Marc Tommasi. 2018. Personalized and Private Peer-to-Peer Machine Learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2018, April 9-11, Canary Islands, Spain*, Vol. 84. PMLR, 473–481.
- [5] John Blitzer, Ryan T. McDonald, and Fernando Pereira. 2006. Domain Adaptation with Structural Correspondence Learning. In *EMNLP 2006, Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 22-23 July 2006, Sydney, Australia*. ACL, 120–128.
- [6] Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y. Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam Tauman Kalai. 2016. Man is to Computer Programmer as Woman is to Homemaker? Debiasing Word Embeddings. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*. 4349–4357.
- [7] Keith Bonawitz, Vladimir Ivanov, Ben Kreuter, Antonio Marcedone, H. Brendan McMahan, Sarvar Patel, Daniel Ramage, Aaron Segal, and Karn Seth. 2017. Practical Secure Aggregation for Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2017, Dallas, TX, USA, October 30 - November 03, 2017*. ACM, 1175–1191.
- [8] Konstantinos Bousmalis, George Trigeorgis, Nathan Silberman, Dilip Krishnan, and Dumitru Erhan. 2016. Domain Separation Networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*. 343–351.
- [9] Duc Bui, Kshitiz Malik, Jack Goetz, Honglei Liu, Seungwhan Moon, Anuj Kumar, and Kang G. Shin. 2019. Federated User Representation Learning. *CoRR* abs/1909.12535 (2019).
- [10] Yitao Cai and Xiaojun Wan. 2019. Multi-Domain Sentiment Classification Based on Domain-Aware Embedding and Attention. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*. ijcai.org, 4904–4910.
- [11] Fei Chen, Zhenhua Dong, Zhenguo Li, and Xiuqiang He. 2018. Federated Meta-Learning for Recommendation. *CoRR* abs/1802.07876 (2018).
- [12] Huimin Chen, Maosong Sun, Cunchao Tu, Yankai Lin, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2016. Neural Sentiment Classification with User and Product Attention. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 1650–1659.
- [13] Mingqing Chen, Rajiv Mathews, Tom Ouyang, and Françoise Beaufays. 2019. Federated Learning Of Out-Of-Vocabulary Words. *CoRR* abs/1903.10635 (2019).
- [14] Mingqing Chen, Ananda Theertha Suresh, Rajiv Mathews, Adeline Wong, Cyril Allauzen, Françoise Beaufays, and Michael Riley. 2019. Federated Learning of N-Gram Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, CoNLL 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-4, 2019*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 121–130.
- [15] Xilun Chen and Claire Cardie. 2018. Multinomial Adversarial Networks for Multi-Domain Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1226–1240.
- [16] Ronan Collobert and Jason Weston. 2008. A unified architecture for natural language processing: deep neural networks with multitask learning. In *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference (ICML 2008), Helsinki, Finland, June 5-9, 2008*, Vol. 307. ACM, 160–167.
- [17] Li Dong, Furu Wei, Chuanqi Tan, Duyu Tang, Ming Zhou, and Ke Xu. 2014. Adaptive Recursive Neural Network for Target-dependent Twitter Sentiment Classification. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2014, June 22-27, 2014, Baltimore, MD, USA, Volume 2: Short Papers*. The Association for Computer Linguistics, 49–54.
- [18] Zi-Yi Dou. 2017. Capturing User and Product Information for Document Level Sentiment Analysis with Deep Memory Network. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-11, 2017*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 521–526.

- [19] Hongliang Fei and Ping Li. 2020. Cross-Lingual Unsupervised Sentiment Classification with Multi-View Transfer Learning. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5759–5771.
- [20] Robin C. Geyer, Tassilo Klein, and Moin Nabi. 2017. Differentially Private Federated Learning: A Client Level Perspective. *CoRR* abs/1712.07557 (2017).
- [21] Arthur Gretton, Olivier Bousquet, Alexander J. Smola, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2005. Measuring Statistical Dependence with Hilbert-Schmidt Norms. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory, 16th International Conference, ALT 2005, Singapore, October 8-11, 2005, Proceedings*, Vol. 3734. Springer, 63–77.
- [22] Geoffrey E. Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. 2015. Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network. *CoRR* abs/1503.02531 (2015).
- [23] Kevin Hsieh, Amar Phanishayee, Onur Mutlu, and Phillip B. Gibbons. 2019. The Non-IID Data Quagmire of Decentralized Machine Learning. *CoRR* abs/1910.00189 (2019).
- [24] Xixi Huang, Ye Ding, Zoe Lin Jiang, Shuhan Qi, Xuan Wang, and Qing Liao. 2020. DP-FL: a novel differentially private federated learning framework for the unbalanced data. *World Wide Web* 23, 4 (2020), 2529–2545.
- [25] Eunjeong Jeong, Seungeun Oh, Hyesung Kim, Jihong Park, Mehdi Bennis, and Seong-Lyun Kim. 2018. Communication-Efficient On-Device Machine Learning: Federated Distillation and Augmentation under Non-IID Private Data. *CoRR* abs/1811.11479 (2018).
- [26] Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. 2015. Effective Use of Word Order for Text Categorization with Convolutional Neural Networks. In *NAACL HLT 2015, The 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Denver, Colorado, USA, May 31 - June 5, 2015*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 103–112.
- [27] Peter Kairouz, H. Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Keith Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, Rafael G. L. D'Oliveira, Salim El Rouayheb, David Evans, Josh Gardner, Zachary Garrett, Adrià Gascón, Badi Ghazi, Phillip B. Gibbons, Marco Gruteser, Zaid Harchaoui, Chaoyang He, Lie He, Zhouyuan Huo, Ben Hutchinson, Justin Hsu, Martin Jaggi, Tara Javidi, Gauri Joshi, Mikhail Khodak, Jakub Konečný, Aleksandra Korolova, Farinaz Koushanfar, Sanmi Koyejo, Tancrède Lepoint, Yang Liu, Prateek Mittal, Mehryar Mohri, Richard Nock, Ayfer Özgür, Rasmus Pagh, Mariana Raykova, Hang Qi, Daniel Ramage, Ramesh Raskar, Dawn Song, Weikang Song, Sebastian U. Stich, Ziteng Sun, Ananda Theertha Suresh, Florian Tramer, Praneeeth Vepakomma, Jianyu Wang, Li Xiong, Zheng Xu, Qiang Yang, Felix X. Yu, Han Yu, and Sen Zhao. 2019. Advances and Open Problems in Federated Learning. *CoRR* abs/1912.04977 (2019).
- [28] Liang Li, Weirui Ye, Mingsheng Long, Yateng Tang, Jin Xu, and Jianmin Wang. 2020. Simultaneous Learning of Pivots and Representations for Cross-Domain Sentiment Classification. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*. AAAI Press, 8220–8227.
- [29] Paul Pu Liang, Terrance Liu, Ziyin Liu, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2020. Think Locally, Act Globally: Federated Learning with Local and Global Representations. *CoRR* abs/2001.01523 (2020).
- [30] Pengfei Liu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2016. Deep Multi-Task Learning with Shared Memory for Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 118–127.
- [31] Pengfei Liu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2016. Recurrent Neural Network for Text Classification with Multi-Task Learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2016, New York, NY, USA, 9-15 July 2016*. IJCAI/AAAI Press, 2873–2879.
- [32] Pengfei Liu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2017. Adversarial Multi-task Learning for Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017, Vancouver, Canada, July 30 - August 4, Volume 1: Long Papers*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1–10.
- [33] Qi Liu, Yue Zhang, and Jiangming Liu. 2018. Learning Domain Representation for Multi-Domain Sentiment Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 541–550.
- [34] Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong He, Li Deng, Kevin Duh, and Ye-Yi Wang. 2015. Representation Learning Using Multi-Task Deep Neural Networks for Semantic Classification and Information Retrieval. In *NAACL HLT 2015, The 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Denver, Colorado, USA, May 31 - June 5, 2015*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 912–921.
- [35] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2017, April 20-22, FL, USA, Vol. 54*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [36] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. In *1st International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2013, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, May 2-4, 2013, Workshop Track Proceedings*.
- [37] Lili Mou, Ran Jia, Yan Xu, Ge Li, Lu Zhang, and Zhi Jin. 2016. Distilling Word Embeddings: An Encoding Approach. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2016, Indianapolis, IN, USA, October 24-28, 2016*. ACM, 1977–1980.
- [38] Jiaqi Mu and Pramod Viswanath. 2018. All-but-the-Top: Simple and Effective Postprocessing for Word Representations. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- [39] Xingchao Peng, Zijun Huang, Yizhe Zhu, and Kate Saenko. 2020. Federated Adversarial Domain Adaptation. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- [40] Daniel Peterson, Pallika Kanani, and Virendra J. Marathe. 2019. Private Federated Learning with Domain Adaptation. *CoRR* abs/1912.06733 (2019).
- [41] Swaroop Ramaswamy, Rajiv Mathews, Kanishka Rao, and Françoise Beaufays. 2019. Federated Learning for Emoji Prediction in a Mobile Keyboard. *CoRR* abs/1906.04329 (2019).
- [42] Vikas Raunak, Vivek Gupta, and Florian Metzke. 2019. Effective Dimensionality Reduction for Word Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP, ReL4NLP@ACL 2019, Florence, Italy, August 2, 2019*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 235–243.
- [43] Sebastian Ruder, Parsa Ghaffari, and John G. Breslin. 2016. A Hierarchical Model of Reviews for Aspect-based Sentiment Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 999–1005.
- [44] Anit Kumar Sahu, Tian Li, Maziar Sanjabi, Manzil Zaheer, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2018. On the Convergence of Federated Optimization in Heterogeneous Networks. *CoRR* abs/1812.06127 (2018).
- [45] Bonggun Shin, Hao Yang, and Jinho D. Choi. 2019. The Pupil Has Become the Master: Teacher-Student Model-Based Word Embedding Distillation with Ensemble Learning. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*. ijcai.org, 3439–3445.
- [46] Virginia Smith, Chao-Kai Chiang, Maziar Sanjabi, and Ameet S. Talwalkar. 2017. Federated Multi-Task Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, CA, USA*. 4424–4434.
- [47] Duyun Tang, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2015. Document Modeling with Gated Recurrent Neural Network for Sentiment Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal, September 17-21, 2015*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 1422–1432.
- [48] Kangkang Wang, Rajiv Mathews, Chloé Kiddon, Hubert Eichner, Françoise Beaufays, and Daniel Ramage. 2019. Federated Evaluation of On-device Personalization. *CoRR* abs/1910.10252 (2019).
- [49] Qian Wang, Minxin Du, Xiuying Chen, Yanjiao Chen, Pan Zhou, Xiaofeng Chen, and Xinyi Huang. 2018. Privacy-Preserving Collaborative Model Learning: The Case of Word Vector Training. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 30, 12 (2018), 2381–2393.
- [50] Tianlu Wang, Xi Victoria Lin, Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Vicente Ordonez, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Double-Hard Debias: Tailoring Word Embeddings for Gender Bias Mitigation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5443–5453.
- [51] Yu Wang. 2019. Single Training Dimension Selection for Word Embedding with PCA. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3595–3600.
- [52] Xi-Zhu Wu, Song Liu, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2019. Heterogeneous Model Reuse via Optimizing Multiparty Multiclass Margin. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, CA, USA, Vol. 97*. PMLR, 6840–6849.
- [53] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated Machine Learning: Concept and Applications. *ACM TIST* 10, 2 (2019), 12:1–12:19.
- [54] Zichao Yang, Diyi Yang, Chris Dyer, Xiaodong He, Alexander J. Smola, and Eduard H. Hovy. 2016. Hierarchical Attention Networks for Document Classification. In *NAACL HLT 2016, The 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*,

- San Diego California, USA, June 12-17, 2016. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 1480–1489.
- [55] Xin Yao, Chaofeng Huang, and Lifeng Sun. 2018. Two-Stream Federated Learning: Reduce the Communication Costs. In *IEEE Visual Communications and Image Processing, VCIP 2018, Taichung, Taiwan, December 9-12, 2018*. IEEE, 1–4.
  - [56] Xin Yao, Tianchi Huang, Chenglei Wu, Rui-Xiao Zhang, and Lifeng Sun. 2019. Towards Faster and Better Federated Learning: A Feature Fusion Approach. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing, ICIP 2019, Taipei, Taiwan, September 22-25, 2019*. IEEE, 175–179.
  - [57] Lei Zhang, Shuai Wang, and Bing Liu. 2018. Deep learning for sentiment analysis: A survey. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Data Min. Knowl. Discov.* 8, 4 (2018).
  - [58] Ying Zhang, Tao Xiang, Timothy M. Hospedales, and Huchuan Lu. 2018. Deep Mutual Learning. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*. IEEE Computer Society, 4320–4328.
  - [59] Yue Zhao, Meng Li, Liangzhen Lai, Naveen Suda, Damon Civin, and Vikas Chandra. 2018. Federated Learning with Non-IID Data. *CoRR* abs/1806.00582 (2018).
  - [60] Renjie Zheng, Junkun Chen, and Xipeng Qiu. 2018. Same Representation, Different Attentions: Shareable Sentence Representation Learning from Multiple Tasks. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2018, July 13-19, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden*. ijcai.org, 4616–4622.
  - [61] Xinjie Zhou, Xiaojun Wan, and Jianguo Xiao. 2016. Attention-based LSTM Network for Cross-Lingual Sentiment Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 247–256.