

How (Mis)calibrated is Your Federated CLIP and What To Do About It?

Mainak Singha¹ Masih Aminbeidokhti² Paolo Casari^{1,3} Elisa Ricci^{1,4} Subhankar Roy⁵

¹ University of Trento, Italy

² École de technologie supérieure, QC, Canada

³ CNIT, Italy

⁴ Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Italy

⁵ University of Bergamo, Italy

Abstract

While vision-language models like CLIP have been extensively studied, their calibration, crucial for reliable predictions, has received limited attention. Although a few prior works have examined CLIP calibration in offline settings, the impact of fine-tuning CLIP in a federated learning (FL) setup remains unexplored. In this work, we investigate how FL affects CLIP calibration and propose strategies to improve reliability in this distributed setting. We first analyze Textual Prompt Tuning approaches and show that they degrade calibration metrics when operating under FL. We also evaluate existing in-training calibration techniques across four global aggregation methods, finding that they provide limited improvements. Our results suggest that the key challenge lies not only in how we aggregate or calibrate, but in which components we choose to fine-tune. Motivated by this insight, we propose FL²oRA, a straightforward LoRA-based approach that naturally improves calibration in FL, and we analyze the factors behind its effectiveness. Experiments on multiple benchmarks demonstrate that FL²oRA consistently produces well-calibrated models, reducing the need for explicit calibration procedures. Codes are available at <https://github.com/mainaksingha01/FL2oRA>.

1. Introduction

Reliability is a critical consideration when deploying deep learning (DL) models in production scenarios. We aim to develop DL models that are not only highly accurate but also reliable. Reliability has many facets, including robustness to covariate shift [12], model calibration [23], and generalization to out-of-distribution data [67]. Of particular interest, model calibration is crucial because it ensures that a model’s predicted probabilities accurately reflect the true likelihood of correctness, enabling reliable decision-making [52]. As powerful DL models (e.g., CLIP [56]) are increasingly being deployed in high-stake applications, such as healthcare and autonomous systems, ensuring proper calibration becomes crucial.

Table 1. **Overview of works focusing on model calibration.** While previous works have studied calibration of CLIP, no work has studied how fine-tuning CLIP in the federated learning (FL) setting affects calibration. Our work explores this direction.

Method	CLIP	Calibration	Fine-tune	Offline	FL
Minderer <i>et al.</i> [46]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Wang <i>et al.</i> [66]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Chu <i>et al.</i> [10]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Our work	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓

Model calibration is a widely studied topic in machine learning [20, 63]. Prior works have shown that although vision-language models, such as CLIP, are reasonably well-calibrated for zero-shot image classification [46], fine-tuning them on downstream tasks often leads to miscalibration [65, 66]. This is concerning because, due to its high generalizability, CLIP is often fine-tuned on small target datasets, which increases the risk of miscalibration. To alleviate miscalibration in downstream tasks, either *post-hoc* calibration techniques (e.g., temperature scaling [23]) or *in-training* calibration techniques (e.g., DCA [42], DOR [66]) have been used. However, fine-tuning is not only limited to the offline setting, where a dataset is available in a centralized location [34, 69, 72], but also in federated learning (FL) [3, 13, 14, 25, 40, 54, 55, 61], which is a more realistic setup. To our surprise, despite the practical relevance and progress in FL, *no prior work has investigated how fine-tuning CLIP affects model calibration in the FL setting.*

In this work, we make an attempt to answer the question: **how (mis)calibrated is CLIP when fine-tuned in a FL setup?** Towards that goal, we first analyze if the trend of miscalibration, observed in the offline CLIP fine-tuning setting [65, 66], also holds true in the FL setting. As shown in Fig. 1, CoOp [72], a textual-prompt tuning approach, when fine-tuned in the FL setup (PromptFL [25]) is even more miscalibrated. Imposing regularization through in-training calibration (e.g., with DCA [42]) to both the offline and FL setting alleviates miscalibration by some extent. This observation conforms with the findings of Chu *et al.* [10], who demonstrated a similar behaviour in the FL setup. However,




Figure 1. **Comparison of reliability diagrams and calibration errors.** Expected Calibration Error (ECE \downarrow) [23] is reported on the OxfordPets [51] dataset on a centralized training or offline (**left**) and a non-IID personalized federal learning (FL) setting (**right**).

as shown in Tab. 1, the work in [10] only experimented with the classical ResNet family of models trained from scratch and did not explore a multimodal setting. Differently, in our study we are specifically interested in analyzing the miscalibration of fine-tuned CLIP models in the FL setup, which exhibits substantially different dynamics from standard Convnets [46]. In Sec. 4, we dive deep into this issue, by investigating other factors for improving calibration, such as incorporating existing calibration techniques, and global aggregation strategies in FL, and find consistent trends.

Although applying extra regularization loss for improving calibration is effective in lowering calibration error, it introduces additional computation and design considerations. Therefore, we strive to find an approach that not only preserves the accuracy of the model, but also ensures a well-calibrated model without introducing additional regularization. To this end, we deviate from the common approach of textual prompt-tuning in FL [4, 25, 40], and adopt low rank adaptation (LoRA [30]) as a means to fine-tune CLIP. We call our approach FL²oRA (**F**ederated **L**earning with **L**oRA). As shown in Fig. 1 (right), FL²oRA alone is better calibrated than PromptFL + DCA, without the need for any explicit regularization on the network.

We further hypothesize that the core problem of miscalibration in the FL setting is not merely *how* we aggregate or calibrate the CLIP base model, but *what* we fine-tune. LoRA due to its property of introducing minimal variations, compounded with the regularization effect induced by FedAvg [45], results in a strongly calibrated model (see Sec. 4.4 for a detailed discussion). Note that the goal of this work is *not* to introduce a novel architecture for FL, but to demonstrate that an appropriately chosen parameter-efficient finetuning technique (PEFT), *i.e.*, LoRA, is sufficient to preserve calibration. Our empirical evaluation in Sec. 4 spanning across three different settings under varying levels of data heterogeneity confirms that fine-tuning with LoRA alone is highly effective in preserving model calibration in the FL setting, and adding extra regularization to improve calibration brings only a marginal improvement.

Contributions. In summary: (i) We are the first to study

the impact of fine-tuning CLIP on the model’s calibration in the FL setup. Our study reveals that such models, without any extra calibration, are miscalibrated, and thus deserve more attention to improve their calibration. (ii) We present FL²oRA, a simple and effective approach, that departs from the dominant approach of fine-tuning CLIP with textual prompt-tuning. (iii) We perform extensive experiments across diverse FL scenarios and demonstrate that our LoRA-based federated fine-tuning approach consistently serves as a strong baseline, potentially eliminating the need of additional regularization for improved calibration.

2. Related Work

Federated Learning (FL) enables collaborative model training across decentralized clients without sharing local data. A key challenge lies in client heterogeneity, *e.g.*, data on different clients is typically non-IID, which negatively affect performance. Previous research on FL primarily focused on developing robust aggregation and optimization strategies to mitigate these issues. Representative approaches include FedAvg [45], the reference FL algorithm that averages client model updates and FedProx [41], which adds a proximal term to each client’s local objective to limit client drift under heterogeneity. Other methods improve over FedAvg with respect to convergence using control variates to reduce variance caused by non-IID updates [32] or modifying local objectives with dynamic regularizers. The main objective of these works is similar: improve the quality of the global model (*e.g.*, accuracy, convergence) obtained by aggregating heterogeneous client updates.

In this work, we study an underexplored aspect of FL, *i.e.* how federated training affects model calibration in VLMs.

Federated Fine-tuning of CLIP. When applied to large VLMs like CLIP [56], FL faces major challenges, as fine-tuning millions of parameters implies high computational and communication overhead during client training and aggregation. To alleviate these problems, prompt tuning [31, 34, 69, 72] has emerged as an efficient alternative for adapting CLIP. Several works have extended prompt tuning to the federated setting [3, 13, 14, 25, 40, 54, 55, 61]. For

instance, PromptFL [25] adapts prompt learning to decentralized clients by introducing regularization across client prompts. FedOTP [40] and FedTPG [54] enhance communication efficiency and personalization through orthogonal or task-conditioned prompt generation. FedCLIP [44] decouples the global and local adaptation of text and image encoders. Methods such as FedTPG [54] and FedMVP [60] dynamically generate prompts conditioned on auxiliary information (*i.e.* class names or visual attributes).

Differently, in this work we propose to adopt a PEFT approach, *i.e.* LoRA [5], to adapt CLIP in a federated setting. Although FL with LoRA has been explored in the context of Large Language Models [68], prior work has focused mainly on accuracy rather than calibration, and to our knowledge, ours is the first to study model calibration in CLIP-based federated image classification.

Model Calibration [52] measures how well a model predicted confidence scores reflect the true likelihood of correctness. Calibration methods are typically categorized into post-hoc approaches and methods that operate at training time. Post-hoc methods, such as temperature scaling [23] and Dirichlet calibration [37], adjust the model’s output probabilities after training without altering the model parameters, offering simplicity and efficiency but limited flexibility. The latter category of methods modify the learning process itself to encourage well-calibrated predictions. Examples include label smoothing [47], which softens target labels, focal loss [43], which emphasizes harder-to-classify samples and methods like DCA [42] and MDCA [26], which adjust the training objective to optimize calibration metrics. These methods often achieve better calibration than post-hoc approaches but may require careful hyperparameter tuning.

In the context of VLMs, zero-shot CLIP is known to be well-calibrated [46]. However, fine-tuning can negatively impact calibration, prompting recent solutions like DOR [66], DAC [65], and CalShift [33] to restore reliable confidence estimates. Most calibration studies have been conducted in the offline setting. In the FL setting, only a few works [10, 53] have addressed calibration, primarily using convolutional networks that are fully fine-tuned. To the best of our knowledge, no prior work has explored the calibration of CLIP-based FL methods.

3. Preliminaries

In this section, we discuss the preliminaries related to federated learning (Sec. 3.1), federated fine-tuning of CLIP (Sec. 3.2) and model calibration (Sec. 3.3).

3.1. Federated Learning

For the task of image classification, the FL scheme consists of training data scattered among N clients and each client n possess a dataset $\mathcal{D}_n = \{\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, y^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_n|}$, where \mathbf{x}

denotes the input image and y denotes the associated class label. Ideally, we want to train a model by minimizing the empirical risk on the union of datasets of all the clients, $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{n \in N} \mathcal{D}_n$. However, due to the distributed nature of the datasets in the FL setting, we can only train a model on the local data of the client, *ie*, conduct *local training*, as:

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_n|} \mathcal{L}_{ce}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}), y^{(i)}), \quad (1)$$

where θ are the parameters of the n -th client model f_{θ} and \mathcal{L}_{ce} is a supervised cross-entropy loss.

To aggregate knowledge (or *global aggregation*), the FL setting involves clients communicating the weights of the trained model f_{θ} to the server through multiple rounds of communication. In each aggregation round t , the server aggregates client weights via a weighted average, or more concretely using the FedAvg [45] as:

$$\theta_t = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{|\mathcal{D}_n|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \theta_t^{(n)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\theta_t^{(n)}$ is the weights of the n -th client. After aggregation, the server sends back θ_t to the clients, which is used as a starting point for further local training.

In this work, we operate in a non-IID FL setup [28], where each client n can have varying number of classes, and the classes overlap among clients. This is more challenging than the prior CLIP-based FL literature [54] that assumes the classes to be disjoint among the clients.

3.2. Federated fine-tuning of CLIP

Textual prompt tuning (TPT), *ie*, CoOp [72], is a commonly used fine-tuning approach to improve the classification accuracy of CLIP on downstream tasks. For fine-tuning, TPT learns a set of prompts while keeping the weights of the pre-trained CLIP image encoder \mathcal{E}_v and text encoder \mathcal{E}_t frozen. In detail, TPT replaces handcrafted prompts (*eg*, “*a photo of a [CLS]*”) at the input of the text encoder \mathcal{E}_t with a set of lightweight learnable vectors $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M\}$, where M denotes the length of the tokens. Text features are computed with the prompt $\mathbf{t} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M, [\text{CLS}]\}$, and the image features are computed from the image \mathbf{x} , using the respective encoders. The prompts \mathcal{T} are learned using the standard cross-entropy loss, as in Eq. (1).

Since the prompts \mathcal{T} in TPT are lightweight and incur low communication overhead, it has become a dominant approach for fine-tuning CLIP in the FL setting [4, 25, 44]. Each client trains prompts \mathcal{T} on the local client data and communicates them with the server. The server aggregates the prompts \mathcal{T} from different clients using Eq. (2), and sends back the aggregated prompts back to the clients. TPT-based FL methods differ mostly in how the prompts are designed, trained locally, and aggregated on the server.

While TPT is not the only approach to fine-tune CLIP in the FL setting, it remains the most dominant approach. Works in related areas have explored using Adapters [18] for fine-tuning CLIP in the FL setting [44], and LoRA [29] for fine-tuning LLMs in a multi-task [6] and FL setting [68].

3.3. Model calibration

Besides accuracy, we also want a model to be well-calibrated. That is, we want the predicted class probabilities of the model to be an accurate representation of the model’s accuracy [23]. Formally, a model is said to be well-calibrated (or *confidence-calibrated*), if for a confidence of c , the model is correct c proportions of the time:

$$\mathbb{P}(y = \arg \max(\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})) \mid \max(\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})) = c) = c \quad \forall c \in [0, 1],$$

where (\mathbf{x}, y) is a datapoint, and $\hat{p}(\cdot)$ returns a discrete probability distribution over a set of C classes. In practice, to quantify miscalibration, we use the summary metric Expected Calibration Error (ECE) [23] that measures the difference between accuracy and confidence. To compute ECE for n samples in the dataset, we group the samples into G equal-sized bins $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_G\}$ based on the prediction confidence of the model, and take a weighted average over the absolute difference between the average accuracy and average confidence:

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{|b_g|}{n} |\text{acc}(b_g) - \text{conf}(b_g)|,$$

where $\text{acc}(\cdot)$ and $\text{conf}(\cdot)$ denotes the average accuracy and average confidence of the model for the samples falling in the bin b_g , respectively. A well-calibrated model will have a low ECE.

In the context of a centralized setting, it has been shown in the literature that although zero-shot CLIP (ZS-CLIP) is well-calibrated [46] for the few-shot image classification setting, fine-tuning can make a model miscalibrated [65, 66]. In particular, during CLIP fine-tuning, a regularization term (eg, regularizing text encoder divergence [66]) is added by the in-training calibration methods to prevent the model from being miscalibrated. Although pertinent, no prior work has studied the impact of fine-tuning CLIP on the model’s calibration in a FL setting.

4. Empirical Evaluation

4.1. Experimental setup

Benchmarks and settings. For evaluation, we use 10 benchmarks: CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 [36], OfficeHome [62], PACS [15], VLCS [16], Food101 [7], DTD [11], Caltech101 [17], Flowers102 [48], and OxfordPets [51]. We follow the non-IID FL setting, where the clients have training data of variable number of classes and the classes can be

shared among the clients, ie, overlapping classes. Following previous work [9, 58], we simulate data heterogeneity by partitioning the data among the clients by setting the parameter $\alpha = 0.5$ of a symmetric Dirichlet distribution.

We group the benchmarks in a manner to simulate different characteristics of a heterogeneous setup: (i) *in-distribution* setting where only a single dataset (eg, CIFAR-100) is distributed among the clients, (ii) *domain generalization* setting where different domains of the same benchmark are distributed among the clients (eg, the four domains of OfficeHome), and (iii) a *base-to-new generalization* setting where some of the classes are held out during training to measure generalization on unseen classes. Details of different settings have been reported in the Appendix.

Baselines. In this study, we consider a range of TPT methods proposed for the task of image classification with CLIP. In particular, we consider the following methods:

- [–] CoOp [72], the seminal paper that proposed TPT for image classification in the centralized setting. In addition, PromptFL [25] that extends CoOp to the FL setting.

- [–] KgCoOp [69] that adds a regularization term to CoOp optimization, and its FL variant FedKgCoOp.

- [–] MaPLe [34] that extends TPT also to the vision encoder, and its FL variant FedMaPLe.

- [–] State-of-the-art TPT methods that have been specifically designed to operate in the personalized FL setting: FedPGP [13], FedOTP [40] and FedPHA [14].

For improving calibration off-the-shelf, we have used three widely used approaches: temperature scaling [23], which is a post-hoc calibration technique; and two in-training calibration techniques, DCA [42] and MDCA [27].

Implementation Details. In our experiments, we employ the frozen ViT-B/16 variant of CLIP backbone. We consider the rank of LoRA metrics to 2 and a dropout rate of 0.25 to regularize the input of the LoRA modules. We keep $\alpha = 0.5$ of a Dirichlet distribution, communication rounds 50 with local epoch 1 with participation rate of 100% for all datasets, except CIFAR-10/100 with 10% participation rate. We choose 16 shots per class across over 10 clients for base-to-new generalization task, two clients per domain in domain generalization and 100 clients per dataset on in-distribution setting. We inherit the optimizer setup, using SGD [57] with a learning rate of 1×10^{-3} , warm-up constant of 1×10^{-5} and a batch size of 32.

Evaluation metrics. To compare methods, we use the following 4 metrics: classification accuracy (Acc \uparrow), Expected Calibration Error (ECE \downarrow) [23], Maximum Calibration Error (MCE \downarrow) [23], and Adaptive Calibration Error (ACE \downarrow) [50]. We report performances in the personalized FL setting [13, 14, 40], where the metrics are computed at each client and then averaged across clients.

Table 2. **Comparison of offline CLIP fine-tuning with federated CLIP fine-tuning.** Results have been reported on the *in-distribution* setting using datasets: CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100.

Method	CIFAR-10				CIFAR-100			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	89.91	10.16	2.62	8.54	66.84	15.06	3.84	14.98
Offline setting (without calibration)								
CoOp [72]	93.99	1.00	0.56	0.89	77.86	1.93	0.57	1.77
KgCoOp [69]	92.17	2.70	0.61	2.70	74.73	7.83	1.13	7.83
MaPLe [34]	97.08	9.05	1.45	1.81	85.01	5.42	2.04	4.72
Offline setting (with calibration: DCA [42])								
CoOp	93.89	1.20	0.62	0.87	77.85	1.83	0.73	1.71
KgCoOp	92.37	2.21	0.46	2.21	74.82	5.30	0.80	5.30
MaPLe	96.96	10.93	1.56	2.10	84.99	5.91	2.11	5.17
FL setting (without calibration)								
FedCoOp [25]	92.42	4.94	1.64	3.94	72.43	9.27	2.43	8.66
FedKgCoOp	90.48	6.53	1.88	5.79	70.68	11.20	2.95	11.05
FedMaPLe	96.08	3.49	1.28	2.18	81.73	7.53	2.20	6.93

4.2. Calibration error in federated learning

In this section, we compare the calibration error of TPT-based methods in both the offline and FL setting. The goal of this comparison is to understand whether the miscalibration of TPT-based methods (eg, CoOp, KgCoOp), observed by Wang et. al., [66] in the offline CLIP fine-tuning setting, also holds true in the FL setting, which is the main focus of this work. To this end, in Tab. 2 we report the performance of three families of models: (i) TPT methods without calibration in the offline setting (eg, CoOp [72]), (ii) TPT methods along with in-training calibration (eg, CoOp + DCA [42]) in the offline setting, and (iii) TPT methods without calibration in the FL setting (eg, FedCoOp or PromptFL [25]). The experiments were performed in the *in-distribution* setting, which was introduced in Sec. 4.1. Note that the offline methods operate in a centralized setting.

We observe that, on average, the TPT methods in the offline setting (first part of Tab. 2) have a worse calibration error than the same TPT methods coupled with a calibration technique (second part of Tab. 2). This is not surprising and have been empirically validated in previous works [66]. However, what remained previously unexplored in the literature is an analysis of: **fine-tuning CLIP in a distributed setting worsens calibration to what extent?** In the final part of Tab. 2 we observe that the same TPT methods when employed in the FL setting, exhibit much worse calibration error across all three calibration metrics. While this may not appear as a surprise to a reader, because Chu et. al., [10] have demonstrated a similar behaviour: with all else being equal, miscalibration worsens in the FL setting. However, the study in [10] is limited to ResNets, where the networks have been trained from scratch in each client. In contrary, our analyses encompass fine-tuning CLIP in FL setting, which has more significant implications given the widespread adoption of CLIP in downstream tasks.

The results in Tab. 2 suggest that miscalibration due to fine-tuning CLIP in FL is inevitable, as in ResNets [10]. Thus, evaluating the progress of FL based on accuracy

Table 3. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Results have been reported on the *in-distribution* setting using datasets: CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. Best number is in **bold**, and second best is underlined.

Method	CIFAR-10				CIFAR-100			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	89.91	10.16	2.62	8.54	66.84	15.06	3.84	14.98
FL setting (without calibration)								
PromptFL [25]	92.42	4.94	1.64	3.94	72.43	9.27	2.43	8.66
FedPGP [13]	91.28	5.89	1.78	5.17	71.13	9.91	2.59	9.78
FedOTP [40]	94.38	6.03	1.74	5.37	74.81	14.44	3.63	14.30
FedPHA [14]	93.72	4.59	1.47	3.52	74.23	8.91	2.33	8.61
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	92.64	4.99	1.68	3.77	73.71	8.58	2.28	8.13
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	97.08	2.94	1.14	1.98	83.00	7.18	2.13	6.39
FL ² oRA (Ours)	97.04	2.99	<u>1.12</u>	2.06	<u>83.70</u>	<u>6.70</u>	<u>2.05</u>	6.09
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])								
PromptFL [25]	92.12	4.98	1.73	3.92	72.07	8.92	2.34	8.77
FedPGP [13]	91.54	5.65	1.75	4.69	71.36	10.38	2.73	10.14
FedOTP [40]	94.30	5.41	1.59	4.53	74.63	12.67	3.27	12.52
FedPHA [14]	93.53	4.81	1.46	3.41	75.30	8.06	2.20	7.63
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	92.54	5.08	1.77	4.13	73.94	8.70	2.34	8.29
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	97.14	2.75	1.11	1.93	83.16	7.08	2.31	6.32
FL ² oRA (Ours)	97.00	2.99	1.15	1.87	83.65	6.64	2.12	6.20
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])								
PromptFL [25] [27]	92.31	5.07	1.67	3.95	72.02	9.18	2.45	8.85
FedPGP [13]	90.98	5.68	1.79	5.06	71.88	9.82	2.66	9.65
FedOTP [40]	94.24	5.83	1.77	5.17	74.73	14.42	3.60	14.45
FedPHA [14]	93.55	4.78	1.53	3.38	75.34	8.65	2.39	8.11
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	92.66	5.11	1.73	3.87	73.72	8.66	2.29	8.15
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	97.07	<u>2.83</u>	<u>1.12</u>	1.92	82.98	7.19	2.14	6.37
FL ² oRA (Ours)	96.92	3.03	1.15	1.96	83.73	6.82	2.01	<u>6.13</u>

alone, as in recent state-of-the-art FL methods [13, 14, 40], gives an incomplete assessment of performance.

4.3. Can we improve calibration?

Given that existing CLIP-based TPT methods worsen calibration in FL, a natural question is **whether calibration can be meaningfully improved and how?** To answer this, we systematically evaluate state-of-the-art TPT methods for personalized FL across three benchmarks (*in-distribution*, *domain generalization*, and *base-to-new generalization*), ablate two in-training calibration techniques (DCA [42], MDCA [27]), and compare four global aggregation methods (FedAvg [45], FedProx [41], FedDyn [1], FedNova [64]). We discuss the following:

[–] Table 3 reports results on the *in-distribution* benchmark using CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 [36], where classes are distributed across 100 clients with a 10% participation rate per communication round.

[–] Table 4 presents results on the *domain generalization* benchmark for OfficeHome [62], PACS [15], and VLCS [16]. We instantiate two clients per domain and train with 100% client participation. We report performance averaged over all domains and datasets; per-domain results are in the Appendix.

[–] Finally, Table 5 evaluates the *base-to-new generalization* benchmark on five visual classification datasets: Food101 [7], DTD [11], Caltech101 [17], Flowers102 [48], and OxfordPets [51], using 16 shots per class. We assign 10 clients per dataset with full participation. For each dataset, half of the classes are treated as base (seen) classes during training, and evaluation measures performance on both base

Table 4. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Average performance have been reported on the *domain generalization* setting using the datasets: OfficeHome, PACS and VLCS. Best number is in **bold**, and second best is underlined.

Method	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	86.98	5.76	1.93	5.74
FL setting (without calibration)				
PromptFL [25]	91.25	2.88	1.21	2.79
FedPGP [13]	92.71	2.67	0.88	2.24
FedOTP [40]	91.07	9.34	2.36	9.20
FedPHA [14]	92.87	2.29	0.81	1.96
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	91.49	2.84	0.95	2.58
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	92.93	2.23	0.84	1.98
FL ² oRA (Ours)	93.11	2.37	0.79	<u>1.83</u>
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])				
PromptFL [25]	91.32	3.07	1.22	2.87
FedPGP [13]	93.93	2.28	0.68	2.06
FedOTP [40]	91.54	7.37	1.90	7.27
FedPHA [14]	93.93	2.17	0.64	2.02
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	91.40	2.63	0.97	2.47
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	92.89	2.56	0.86	2.05
FL ² oRA (Ours)	93.13	2.09	0.72	1.95
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])				
PromptFL [25]	91.32	2.91	1.21	2.77
FedPGP [13]	<u>94.04</u>	2.29	0.90	1.90
FedOTP [40]	91.88	9.26	2.40	9.24
FedPHA [14]	94.06	2.23	0.94	1.83
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	91.46	2.50	0.85	2.34
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	92.93	<u>2.10</u>	0.80	1.91
FL ² oRA (Ours)	93.07	2.24	0.77	1.64

and novel classes; we report the harmonic mean across all datasets. Detailed per-dataset results are in the Appendix.

Effect of calibration techniques. Across all federated settings, in-training calibration with DCA or MDCA yields only modest gains. As shown in Table 3, on CIFAR-10/100, applying DCA or MDCA to FL prompt-tuning methods produces small reductions in ECE and ACE for some configurations (e.g., PromptFL, FedPHA on CIFAR-100), but many methods remain noticeably miscalibrated. For instance, FedOTP on CIFAR-100 still has ECE above 12% after DCA and above 14% after MDCA. A similar pattern appears on domain generalization and base-to-new generalization (Tables 4 and 5): DCA and MDCA slightly improve FedPGP and FedPHA in some cases, yet other methods (again notably FedOTP) stay severely miscalibrated, with ECE often exceeding 7–9%. Overall, **in-training calibration in TPT for FL rarely produces large, systematic improvements and sometimes even increases MCE.**

Effect of global aggregation. We next test whether stronger FL optimizers can alleviate miscalibration. As shown in Tab. 6, replacing FedAvg with FedProx, FedDyn, or FedNova produces no consistent improvement in either accuracy or calibration. The ECE/MCE/ACE metrics of these optimizers closely track those of FedAvg and

Table 5. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Average performance have been reported on the *base-to-new generalization* setting using the datasets: Food101, DTD, Caltech101, Flowers102, and OxfordPets. Best number is in **bold**, and second best is underlined.

Method	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	82.05	4.52	1.43	4.69
FL setting (without calibration)				
PromptFL [25]	82.98	4.11	1.31	3.82
FedPGP [13]	81.09	6.17	2.07	5.97
FedOTP [40]	29.52	21.88	5.03	21.90
FedPHA [14]	54.97	16.03	4.64	15.69
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	<u>86.70</u>	3.58	1.13	3.21
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	84.39	4.34	1.33	4.06
FL ² oRA (Ours)	86.25	3.91	1.41	3.20
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])				
PromptFL [25]	84.25	3.97	1.30	3.62
FedPGP [13]	80.90	5.82	1.82	5.69
FedOTP [40]	28.63	26.57	7.34	26.63
FedPHA [14]	54.56	17.93	5.53	17.38
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	86.80	3.63	1.20	2.97
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	84.31	3.13	1.05	<u>3.07</u>
FL ² oRA (Ours)	86.08	4.21	1.61	3.32
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])				
PromptFL [25]	84.62	4.06	1.23	3.73
FedPGP [13]	81.51	4.93	1.65	4.80
FedOTP [40]	28.53	25.35	6.25	25.32
FedPHA [14]	52.34	20.55	6.63	19.86
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	86.32	<u>3.42</u>	<u>1.07</u>	3.11
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	84.37	4.17	1.31	4.00
FL ² oRA (Ours)	86.34	4.10	1.55	3.35

typically differ only within run-to-run variability; in several cases, FedAvg is slightly better. This suggests that the **calibration issues of TPT for FL are not primarily driven by the choice of aggregation algorithm**, but by how prompts are adapted under client heterogeneity.

Improving calibration through LoRA fine-tuning. The evidence above suggests that the core problem is not merely how we aggregate or calibrate CLIP-based TPT models, but *what* we fine-tune. Prompt-tuning operates only on a small set of continuous prompts while keeping CLIP’s backbone frozen. In federated settings with heterogeneous clients, this makes the prompts highly sensitive to local idiosyncrasies: each client learns sharp, overconfident decision boundaries on top of a fixed representation, and FedAvg must reconcile these conflicting prompt updates. As a result, logits are systematically overconfident and post-hoc calibration has little room to correct the mismatch between frozen features and locally adapted prompts.

A natural alternative is to adapt the backbone itself in a parameter-efficient way. Rather than relying solely on prompts to absorb all client heterogeneity, we allow the shared representation to move slightly so that the induced feature geometry is better aligned with federated label dis-

Table 6. **Comparison of different global aggregation algorithms.** Results have been reported on the *in-distribution* setting *without* applying any calibration using CIFAR-100 dataset. Best number is in **bold**, and second best is underlined.

Method	FedAvg [45]				FedProx [41]			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
PromptFL	72.43	9.27	2.43	8.66	73.12	8.16	2.24	7.29
FedKgCoOp	70.68	11.20	2.95	11.05	71.56	11.08	2.86	8.57
FedMaPLe	81.73	7.53	2.20	6.93	82.68	7.84	2.34	7.05
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	73.71	8.58	2.28	8.13	74.06	8.82	2.45	8.45
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	83.00	7.18	<u>2.13</u>	6.39	82.91	7.25	2.25	6.64
FL ² oRA (Ours)	83.70	6.70	2.05	6.09	<u>83.55</u>	6.86	2.14	<u>6.15</u>

Method	FedDyn [1]				FedNova [64]			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
PromptFL	73.28	8.34	2.35	7.56	72.89	9.54	3.27	8.89
FedKgCoOp	71.78	11.45	2.39	7.34	70.38	12.38	3.21	8.32
FedMaPLe	82.07	7.08	2.19	7.06	81.38	8.26	2.93	8.19
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	74.95	8.82	2.50	8.05	74.58	9.05	2.93	8.67
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	83.18	7.78	2.47	6.80	82.67	8.81	3.01	7.04
FL ² oRA (Ours)	83.42	<u>6.79</u>	2.15	<u>6.15</u>	82.89	7.03	2.56	6.67

tributions. This motivates our use of LoRA-based PEFT on CLIP under the FL setting, which we denote as FL²oRA.

LoRA augments linear layers of CLIP’s vision and/or text encoders with low-rank adapters. LoRA applies to any linear transformation with weights $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ by expressing the update $\delta W = \alpha AB$ in low rank matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$, where r is the LoRA rank and α is a fixed scaling factor (typically $\alpha = 1/r$). We consider three variants of LoRA-based fine-tuning: applying LoRA to the text encoder only (**FL²oRA-text**), to the vision encoder only (**FL²oRA-vision**), or to both encoders (**FL²oRA**). FL²oRA, and its variants, apply LoRA to all layers of the corresponding encoder.

In sharp contrast to TPT, the only consistent and substantial calibration gains come from parameter-efficient fine-tuning of CLIP’s backbone, as implemented in our FL²oRA variants. On CIFAR-10/100 (Tab. 3), FL²oRA-vision and FL²oRA achieve the best or near-best accuracy and clearly outperform all prompt-tuning baselines in ECE/MCE/ACE, both with and without calibration. For example, on CIFAR-100 without calibration, FL²oRA improves accuracy from 74.81% (FedOTP) to 83.70% and reduces ECE from 14.44% (FedOTP) and 8.91% (FedPHA) down to 6.70%. On the domain generalization benchmark (Tab. 4), FL²oRA achieves the highest accuracy without calibration (93.11%) and, after applying DCA or MDCA, offers the best ECE/ACE trade-off: FL²oRA attains the lowest ACE with DCA (1.95) and with MDCA (1.64), while FL²oRA-vision achieves the best ECE and MCE under MDCA. On the more challenging base-to-new setting (Tab. 5), where all methods exhibit worse calibration and post-hoc calibration has a stronger effect, FL²oRA-text attains the highest accuracy across all configurations, and our LoRA variants match or surpass the calibrated versions of competing baselines in both accuracy and calibration.

Taken together, these results indicate that CLIP with parameter-efficient LoRA fine-tuning or **FL²oRA naturally produces well-calibrated models in FL, substan-**

tially reducing the need for explicit calibration procedures. In contrast, CLIP-based TPT methods consistently degrade calibration in FL, and even strong in-training calibration techniques and advanced FL optimizers fail to correct this behavior fully.

4.4. What makes FL²oRA effective?

In this section, we provide a high-level, largely qualitative discussion of why FL²oRA may be particularly effective for federated CLIP fine-tuning. We emphasize that this is an *interpretive* account grounded in prior work and our empirical trends, rather than a mechanism that we have explicitly validated through targeted ablations.

During local training, each client updates only the low-rank LoRA parameters while the original CLIP weights and classifier remain frozen; the server then aggregates these adapter parameters using FedAvg. As illustrated in Fig. 1 and Tab. 3, 4, and 5, this lightweight modification consistently improves both accuracy and calibration relative to existing CLIP-based FL methods across all benchmarks.

Implicit ensembling via FedAvg. FedAvg can be viewed as a form of implicit ensembling or weight-space bagging: each client trains on its own data partition, and the server averages their parameters. Ensembling is well known to improve calibration [2, 38], but its benefits rely on the individual models having reasonably compatible confidence scales i.e., none of them being extremely overconfident or poorly calibrated [70]. From this perspective, earlier FL methods that fully fine-tune all weights may produce client models whose logits are very differently scaled, limiting the extent to which FedAvg can act as a stabilizing ensemble [10, 53]. In contrast, if each client’s local model stays closer to a well-calibrated pre-trained solution, averaging their parameters is more likely to yield a calibrated global model [70].

LoRA helps preserve calibration. LoRA typically leaves most pre-trained weights unchanged and restricts adaptation to a low-rank update [59]. Prior work suggests that such updates can remain closer to the pre-trained solution in weight space and preserve its behavior more faithfully than standard regularization alone [5]. From a calibration standpoint, this may help avoid large shifts in weight norms and logit scales, which are known contributors to miscalibration [46, 59]. By constraining local adaptation to a low-rank subspace, FL²oRA encourages each client to stay within a neighborhood where CLIP is already reasonably calibrated, while still allowing meaningful task-specific and client-specific adaptation.

Putting these observations together, we hypothesize that FL²oRA benefits from a favorable combination of (i) CLIP’s strong zero-shot calibration as a starting point, (ii) the stability and norm control induced by LoRA updates, and (iii) the ensemble-like regularization effect of FedAvg over heterogeneous clients. While our experiments do not




Figure 2. **Effect of varying α of Dirichlet distribution.** We report (a) Accuracy and (b) ECE metrics on CIFAR-100 dataset.




Figure 3. **Effect of varying communication rounds.** We report (a) Accuracy and (b) ECE metrics on CIFAR-100 dataset.

isolate these factors individually, this perspective is consistent with the empirical finding that FL²oRA not only preserves but often *improves* calibration while simultaneously boosting accuracy in federated learning.

4.5. Ablation Studies

We perform a thorough ablation analysis on the *in-distribution* setting using the CIFAR-100 dataset. For each ablation study we report the accuracy and ECE metrics.

Sensitivity to data distribution. We study the impact of varying α , the concentration parameter of the Dirichlet distribution, which controls the overlap of classes among clients. A low value of α signifies a low overlap among clients (ie, non-IID), and a high value of alpha signifies a high overlap among clients (ie, IID). From Fig. 2 we observe that for our proposed FL²oRA, both accuracy and ECE remain fairly stable at varying levels of heterogeneity. Although competitor methods, such as FedPGP and FedPHA, exhibit improved ECE with respect to the simple baseline ZS-CLIP, they fluctuate with different values of α .

Sensitivity to communication rounds. We vary the communication rounds between 10 and 100 to study the impact of frequency of client-server communication on performance. From Fig. 3 we observe the consistent trend that all the methods benefit from more frequent communication between the clients and the server, both in terms of accuracy and ECE scores. However, FL²oRA achieves the best performance, with only 10 rounds of communication, even outperforming the competitors operating under maximum number of communication rounds.

Sensitivity to rank in FL²oRA. We study the impact of rank r of LoRA, as it controls how much capacity the adapter has to modify the base CLIP model. A higher rank




Figure 4. **Ablation of rank of LoRA metrics** as (a) Accuracy and (b) ECE metrics on CIFAR-100 dataset. To be noted, ‘T’ and ‘V’ refer to text and vision respectively.




Figure 5. **Ablation of PEFT strategies.** as (a) Accuracy and (b) ECE metrics on CIFAR-100 dataset.

means more expressive updates, at the cost of increasing the computation and communication overhead, and vice versa. In Fig. 4 we report the different variants of FL²oRA, where we observe that the performance of FL²oRA remains stable in varying ranks. We postulate that performance remains stable because even a lower rank is sufficient to adapt to the new knowledge contained in CIFAR-100. However, for a more complex dataset, a higher rank might be necessary.

Sensitivity to PEFT strategies in FL²oRA. In Fig. 5 we investigate the impact of different PEFT methods including LayerNorm [35] and BitFit [71], alongside LoRA [30] in FL²oRA. Across all experiments, jointly fine-tuning both the text and vision CLIP encoders consistently outperforms unimodal tuning (text or vision) in terms of both accuracy and ECE. Notably, FL²oRA consistently surpasses the LayerNorm and BitFit under all modality tuning configurations, highlighting its effectiveness in maintaining high accuracy while preserving calibration in a FL setup.

5. Conclusions

In this work, we investigated the an unexplored question of how fine-tuning CLIP in a FL setting affects model calibration. Our study reveals that TPT-based methods that perform reasonably in offline settings exhibit worse calibration when operating in FL. While standard in-training calibration techniques offer limited improvements, our analysis suggests that the primary driver of miscalibration is the way prompts are adapted under client heterogeneity. Encouragingly, we find that PEFT approaches, such as LoRA can help. Therefore, we present FL²oRA, and show that it naturally yield to well-calibrated models in FL, substantially reducing the need for additional calibration procedures. By exploring the link between parameter-efficient fine-tuning and FL, our work opens new directions for addressing calibration in CLIP within the federated setting.

References

- [1] Durmus Alp Emre Acar, Yue Zhao, Ramon Matas Navarro, Matthew Mattina, Paul N Whatmough, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Federated learning based on dynamic regularization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 5, 7
- [2] Arsenii Ashukha, Alexander Lyzhov, Dmitry Molchanov, and Dmitry Vetrov. Pitfalls of in-domain uncertainty estimation and ensembling in deep learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 7
- [3] Sikai Bai, Jie Zhang, Song Guo, Shuaicheng Li, Jingcai Guo, Jun Hou, Tao Han, and Xiaocheng Lu. Diprompt: Disentangled prompt tuning for multiple latent domain generalization in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 27284–27293, 2024. 1, 2
- [4] Sikai Bai, Jie Zhang, Song Guo, Shuaicheng Li, Jingcai Guo, Jun Hou, Tao Han, and Xiaocheng Lu. Diprompt: Disentangled prompt tuning for multiple latent domain generalization in federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 27284–27293, 2024. 2, 3
- [5] Dan Biderman, Jacob Portes, Jose Javier Gonzalez Ortiz, Mansheej Paul, Philip Greengard, Connor Jennings, Daniel King, Sam Havens, Vitaliy Chiley, Jonathan Frankle, et al. Lora learns less and forgets less. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)*, 2024. 3, 7
- [6] Ondrej Bohdal, Mete Ozay, Jijoong Moon, Kyenghun Lee, Hyeonmok Ko, and Umberto Michieli. Efficient compositional multi-tasking for on-device large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 28129–28153, 2025. 4
- [7] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101 - mining discriminative components with random forests. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2014. 4, 5
- [8] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101 - mining discriminative components with random forests. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2014. 12
- [9] Yu-Tong Cao, Ye Shi, Baosheng Yu, Jingya Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Knowledge-aware federated active learning with non-iid data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 22279–22289, 2023. 4
- [10] Yun-Wei Chu, Dong-Jun Han, Seyyedali Hosseinalipour, and Christopher Brinton. Unlocking the potential of model calibration in federated learning. *International Conference on Learning Representation (ICLR)*, 2025. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7
- [11] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhransu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3606–3613, 2014. 4, 5, 12
- [12] Gabriela Csurka. Domain adaptation for visual applications: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05374*, 2017. 1
- [13] Tianyu Cui, Hongxia Li, Jingya Wang, and Ye Shi. Harmonizing generalization and personalization in federated prompt learning. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
- [14] Chengying Fang, Wenke Huang, Guancheng Wan, Yihao Yang, and Mang Ye. Fedpha: Federated prompt learning for heterogeneous client adaptation. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
- [15] Chen Fang, Ye Xu, and Daniel N Rockmore. Unbiased metric learning: On the utilization of multiple datasets and web images for softening bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1657–1664, 2013. 4, 5
- [16] Chen Fang, Ye Xu, and Daniel N. Rockmore. Unbiased metric learning: On the utilization of multiple datasets and web images for softening bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2013. 4, 5, 12
- [17] Li Fei-Fei, Rob Fergus, and Pietro Perona. Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshop*, pages 178–178. IEEE, 2004. 4, 5, 12
- [18] Peng Gao, Shijie Geng, Renrui Zhang, Teli Ma, Rongyao Fang, Yongfeng Zhang, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Clip-adapter: Better vision-language models with feature adapters. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(2): 581–595, 2024. 4
- [19] Andrew Gelman, John B Carlin, Hal S Stern, and Donald B Rubin. *Bayesian data analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1995. 12
- [20] Jiahui Geng, Fengyu Cai, Yuxia Wang, Heinz Koepl, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6577–6595, 2024. 1
- [21] W Brier Glenn et al. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Monthly weather review*, 78(1):1–3, 1950. 14
- [22] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. 13
- [23] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. 1, 2, 3, 4, 14
- [24] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. 14

- [25] Tao Guo, Song Guo, Junxiao Wang, Xueyang Tang, and Wenchao Xu. Promptfl: Let federated participants cooperatively learn prompts instead of models-federated learning in age of foundation model. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [14](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#)
- [26] Ramya Hebbalaguppe, Jatin Prakash, Neelabh Madan, and Chetan Arora. A stitch in time saves nine: A train-time regularizing loss for improved neural network calibration. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16081–16090, 2022. [3](#)
- [27] Ramya Hebbalaguppe, Jatin Prakash, Neelabh Madan, and Chetan Arora. A stitch in time saves nine: A train-time regularizing loss for improved neural network calibration. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16081–16090, 2022. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [13](#), [14](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#)
- [28] Tzu-Ming Harry Hsu, Hang Qi, and Matthew Brown. Measuring the effects of non-identical data distribution for federated visual classification. In *NeurIPS Workshop on Federated Learning*, 2019. [3](#)
- [29] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3, 2022. [4](#)
- [30] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, page 3, 2022. [2](#), [8](#)
- [31] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 709–727. Springer, 2022. [2](#)
- [32] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank Reddi, Sebastian Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5132–5143. PMLR, 2020. [2](#)
- [33] Behraj Khan, Rizwan Qureshi, Nouman Muhammad Durani, and Tahir Qasim Syed. Confidence-calibrated covariate shift correction for few-shot classification in vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 6511–6523, 2025. [3](#)
- [34] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Maple: Multi-modal prompt learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 19113–19122, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [5](#)
- [35] Konwoo Kim, Michael Laskin, Igor Mordatch, and Deepak Pathak. How to adapt your large-scale vision-and-language model. 2021. [8](#)
- [36] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009. [4](#), [5](#), [12](#)
- [37] Meelis Kull, Telmo Silva Filho, and Peter Flach. Beta calibration: a well-founded and easily implemented improvement on logistic calibration for binary classifiers. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 623–631. PMLR, 2017. [3](#)
- [38] Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. [7](#)
- [39] Da Li, Yongxin Yang, Yi-Zhe Song, and Timothy M Hospedales. Deeper, broader and artier domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5542–5550, 2017. [12](#)
- [40] Hongxia Li, Wei Huang, Jingya Wang, and Ye Shi. Global and local prompts cooperation via optimal transport for federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12151–12161, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [12](#), [14](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#)
- [41] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *Proceedings of Machine learning and systems*, 2:429–450, 2020. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [42] Gongbo Liang, Yu Zhang, Xiaoqin Wang, and Nathan Jacobs. Improved trainable calibration method for neural networks on medical imaging classification. *British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)*, 2020. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [13](#), [14](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#)
- [43] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2980–2988, 2017. [3](#)
- [44] Wang Lu, HU Xixu, Jindong Wang, and Xing Xie. Fedclip: Fast generalization and personalization for clip in federated learning. In *ICLR Workshop on Trustworthy and Reliable Large-Scale Machine Learning Models*, 2023. [3](#), [4](#)
- [45] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguerre y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [46] Matthias Minderer, Josip Djolonga, Rob Romijnders, Frances Hubis, Xiaohua Zhai, Neil Houlsby, Dustin Tran, and Mario Lucic. Revisiting the calibration of modern neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:15682–15694, 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [14](#)
- [47] Rafael Müller, Simon Kornblith, and Geoffrey E Hinton. When does label smoothing help? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019. [3](#)
- [48] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *2008 Sixth Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics & Image Processing*, pages 722–729, 2008. [4](#), [5](#), [12](#)
- [49] Jeremy Nixon, Michael W Dusenberry, Linchuan Zhang, Ghassen Jerfel, and Dustin Tran. Measuring calibration in deep learning. In *CVPR workshops*, 2019. [13](#)
- [50] Jeremy Nixon, Michael W Dusenberry, Linchuan Zhang, Ghassen Jerfel, and Dustin Tran. Measuring calibration in deep learning. In *CVPR workshops*, 2019. [4](#)
- [51] Omkar M. Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and C. V. Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2012. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [12](#)

- [52] Maja Pavlovic. Understanding model calibration—a gentle introduction and visual exploration of calibration and the expected calibration error (ece). *International Conference on Learning Representations Blogposts*, 2025. 1, 3
- [53] Hongyi Peng, Han Yu, Xiaoli Tang, and Xiaoxiao Li. Fedcal: Achieving local and global calibration in federated learning via aggregated parameterized scaler. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. 3, 7
- [54] Chen Qiu, Xingyu Li, Chaithanya Kumar Mummadi, Madan Ravi Ganesh, Zhenzhen Li, Lu Peng, and Wan-Yi Lin. Federated text-driven prompt generation for vision-language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [55] Chen Qiu, Xingyu Li, Chaithanya Kumar Mummadi, Madan Ravi Ganesh, Zhenzhen Li, Lu Peng, and Wan-Yi Lin. Federated text-driven prompt generation for vision-language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 2
- [56] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1, 2, 5, 6, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
- [57] Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951. 4
- [58] Aviv Shamsian, Aviv Navon, Ethan Fetaya, and Gal Chechik. Personalized federated learning using hypernetworks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 9489–9502. PMLR, 2021. 4
- [59] Jiang-Xin Shi, Tong Wei, Zhi Zhou, Jie-Jing Shao, Xin-Yan Han, and Yu-Feng Li. Long-tail learning with foundation model: Heavy fine-tuning hurts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. 7
- [60] Mainak Singha, Subhankar Roy, Sarthak Mehrotra, Ankit Jha, Moloud Abdar, Biplab Banerjee, and Elisa Ricci. Fedmvp: Federated multi-modal visual prompt tuning for vision-language models. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2025. 3
- [61] Guangyu Sun, Matias Mendieta, Aritra Dutta, Xin Li, and Chen Chen. Towards multi-modal transformers in federated learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 229–246. Springer, 2024. 1, 2
- [62] Hemanth Venkateswara, Jose Eusebio, Shayok Chakraborty, and Sethuraman Panchanathan. Deep hashing network for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5018–5027, 2017. 4, 5, 12
- [63] Cheng Wang. Calibration in deep learning: A survey of the state-of-the-art. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01222*, 2023. 1
- [64] Jianyu Wang, Qinghua Liu, Hao Liang, Gauri Joshi, and H Vincent Poor. Tackling the objective inconsistency problem in heterogeneous federated optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7611–7623, 2020. 5, 7
- [65] Shuoyuan Wang, Jindong Wang, Guoqing Wang, Bob Zhang, Kaiyang Zhou, and Hongxin Wei. Open-vocabulary calibration for fine-tuned clip. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. 1, 3, 4
- [66] Shuoyuan Wang, Yixuan Li, and Hongxin Wei. Understanding and mitigating miscalibration in prompt tuning for vision-language models. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. 1, 3, 4, 5
- [67] Jingkan Yang, Kaiyang Zhou, Yixuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Generalized out-of-distribution detection: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(12):5635–5662, 2024. 1
- [68] Yiyuan Yang, Guodong Long, Qinghua Lu, Liming Zhu, Jing Jiang, and Chengqi Zhang. Federated low-rank adaptation for foundation models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13502*, 2025. 3, 4
- [69] Hantao Yao, Rui Zhang, and Changsheng Xu. Visual-language prompt tuning with knowledge-guided context optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6757–6767, 2023. 1, 2, 4, 5
- [70] LIN Yong, Lu Tan, Yifan HAO, Ho Nam Wong, Hanze Dong, WEIZHONG ZHANG, Yujiu Yang, and Tong Zhang. Spurious feature diversification improves out-of-distribution generalization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 7
- [71] Elad Ben Zaken, Shauli Ravfogel, and Yoav Goldberg. Bitfit: Simple parameter-efficient fine-tuning for transformer-based masked language-models. *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 2021. 8
- [72] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkan Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Table of Supplementary Contents

A Experimental setup	12
A.1 Benchmarks	12
A.2 Federated learning settings	12
A.3 Evaluation protocol and metrics	12
A.4 Calibration baselines	13
B Additional empirical evaluation	14
B.1 Effect of Temperature Scaling	14
B.2 Additional calibration metrics	14
B.3 Impact of client participation rate	15
B.4 Additional insights on improved calibration	15
B.5 Complexity analysis	15
B.6 Detailed results of the main tables	15

A. Experimental setup

A.1. Benchmarks

In our experiments, we evaluate our proposed method across three different federated learning (FL) settings using a diverse collection of benchmark datasets, as summarized in Table 7. For the *in-distribution* setting, we use CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, which are standard image classification datasets with 10 and 100 classes, respectively. Each dataset contains 50,000 training images and 10,000 test images, providing a balanced evaluation scenario where the training and test distributions are identical.

For the *base-to-new generalization* and *domain generalization* settings, we consider more challenging datasets that assess the model’s ability to transfer knowledge to unseen classes or in between multiple domains. In the base-to-new setting, we choose Caltech101, Flowers102, OxfordPets, Food101, and DTD datasets in few-shot training set up. In the domain generalization (DG) setting, we use traditional DG benchmarks having four domains to each i.e. PACS (art painting, cartoon, photo and sketch), OfficeHome (art, clipart, product and realworld), and VLCS (caltech, labelme, pascal-voc and sun), providing distribution shifts.

A.2. Federated learning settings

We describe in detail the three personalized FL settings i.e. *in-distribution*, *domain generalization* and *base-to-new generalization* tackled in this work.

[–] **In-distribution & Domain generalization.** For both settings, we distribute the classes across clients in an overlapping non-IID manner, as similar to [40]. To simulate controllable non-IID data heterogeneity across clients, we adopt the standard Dirichlet-based partitioning strategy. Given a dataset with C classes and N clients, each client’s class proportion vector, $\mathbf{q}_n = (q_{n1}, \dots, q_{nK})$ is sampled from a symmetric Dirichlet distribution [19] parameterized by concentration α :

$$\mathbf{q}_n \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha \mathbf{p}), \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{p} is the global class prior (assumed uniform in our experiments). Once the class proportions are obtained, the actual number of samples assigned to client n is drawn as,

$$\mathbf{c}_n \sim \text{Multinomial}(|\mathcal{D}_n|, \mathbf{q}_n), \quad (4)$$

Table 7. **Statistics of the benchmarks.** The table shows the statistics of the benchmarks used for empirical evaluation in three federated learning settings.

Benchmarks	Domain	Classes	Train	Test
<i>In-distribution setting</i>				
CIFAR-10 [36]	-	10	50,000	10,000
CIFAR-100 [36]	-	100	50,000	10,000
<i>Base-to-new generalization setting</i>				
Caltech101 [17]	-	101	4,128	2,465
Flowers102 [48]	-	102	4,093	2,463
OxfordPets [51]	-	37	2,944	3,369
Food101 [8]	-	101	50,500	30,300
DTD [11]	-	47	2,820	1,692
<i>Domain generalization setting</i>				
PACS [39]	Art Painting	7	1,024	614
	Cartoon		1,171	704
	Photo		835	502
	Sketch		1,964	1,179
OfficeHome [62]	Art	65	1,214	728
	Clipart		2,191	1,298
	Product		2,226	1,324
	RealWorld		2,180	1,304
VLCS [16]	CALTECH	5	891	424
	LABELME		1,672	797
	PASCAL-VOC		2,127	1,013
	SUN		2,067	985

where $|\mathcal{D}_n|$ denotes the local dataset size. The concentration parameter α directly controls the heterogeneity of the federated setting i.e. large α values (e.g., $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$) yield nearly IID client distributions, while small α values (e.g., $\alpha \rightarrow 0$) produce extremely skewed, label-concentrated clients. Figure 6 visualizes this progression, showing how the distribution transitions from highly mixed to strongly partitioned as α decreases. We keep $\alpha = 0.5$ for both the federated settings to maintain the overlapping non-IID in a balanced manner. For in-distribution, we choose 100 clients over 10% participation rate, whereas two clients per domain with 100% participation rate in domain generalization setting.

[–] **Base-to-New generalization.** Unlike the Dirichlet distribution, we adopt a non-overlapping non-IID setting, where each client is assigned a distinct subset of classes, following the similar set up of [13]. Half of the total classes are used for training, while the remaining classes are reserved for evaluation. We configure 10 clients per dataset, with a 100% participation rate for all clients.

A.3. Evaluation protocol and metrics

Evaluation protocol. We evaluate the methods in three aforementioned FL settings in a personalized FL setup [13, 14, 40], where we compute the metrics on the test set in each client and then take an average over all the clients. To be noted that client participation in training may vary according to the participation rate, but inference is performed on all clients regardless of their participation.

Metrics. In our FL experiments, we use the accuracy metric for model performance and ECE, MCE and ACE metrics for model calibration.

[–] **Accuracy.** It measures the proportion of predictions for which the model’s predicted label matches the ground-truth label, providing a standard indicator of overall classification performance.




Figure 6. **Federated data partitioning under different Dirichlet concentration parameter α .** In each of the subplots, each row represents a client and each cell corresponds to a data sample whose color indicates its class label. The sub figures are represented as, (a) Sort and partition setting with two fixed classes per client, (b) to (f) Non-IID splits with Dirichlet distribution, having $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, $\alpha = 100$, 1, 0.5, and $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Larger α produces nearly IID client distributions, whereas smaller α concentrates samples from few classes only within each client with increasingly skewed and heterogenous partitions.

[-] Expected Calibration Error (ECE). ECE [22] measures the average discrepancy between a model’s predicted confidence and its actual accuracy. The prediction confidences are partitioned into G bins, and for each bin b_g , the absolute difference between the empirical accuracy $\text{acc}(b_g)$ and the mean predicted confidence $\text{conf}(b_g)$ is computed. These bin-wise errors are then weighted by the proportion of samples in each bin, yielding a global estimate of how well the model’s confidence reflects the true likelihood of correctness. Lower ECE values indicate better-calibrated predictions. The ECE metric can be defined as:

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{|b_g|}{|\mathcal{D}|} |\text{acc}(b_g) - \text{conf}(b_g)|, \quad (5)$$

where $|\mathcal{D}|$ and $|b_g|$ is the total number of samples in the dataset and g -th bin, respectively.

[-] Maximum Calibration Error (MCE). MCE [22] quantifies the worst-case miscalibration across all bins. Rather than averaging, MCE takes the maximum absolute gap between accuracy and confidence over the G bins. This highlights extreme local over- or under-confidence that may be masked by aggregate metrics such as ECE. A lower MCE value indicates that the model avoids severe calibration failures in any confidence region. The ECE metric can be written as:

$$\text{MCE} = \max_{g \in \{1, \dots, G\}} |\text{acc}(b_g) - \text{conf}(b_g)|. \quad (6)$$

[-] Average Calibration Error (ACE). ACE [49] assesses calibration by averaging the absolute accuracy-confidence discrepancies uniformly across all G bins. Unlike ECE, which weights bins by the number of samples they contain, ACE treats each bin equally, making it more sensitive to miscalibration in sparsely populated regions of the confidence distribution. Lower ACE values reflect more consistent calibration performance across different confidence levels. The ECE metric can be defined as:

$$\text{ACE} = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G |\text{acc}(b_g) - \text{conf}(b_g)|, \quad (7)$$

A.4. Calibration baselines

In our experimental settings, we consider two standalone calibration methods DCA [42] and MDCA [27] as additional plug-ins in

the federated methods.

[-] Difference-between-Confidence-Accuracy (DCA). DCA [42] provides a minibatch-level calibration objective by penalizing the discrepancy between the model’s average predicted confidence score corresponding to the true class and its average empirical accuracy for all the samples in a minibatch. For each prediction corresponding to the i -th sample, the method computes the correctness indicator c_i (which equals 1 if the prediction is correct and 0 otherwise) and the predicted confidence of the true label $s_i = p(\hat{y}_i)$. By minimizing this deviation, DCA encourages the model’s overall confidence level to align with its average true accuracy, thereby improving global calibration behavior. For a minibatch of size m , the loss is computed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{dca}} = \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m c_i - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m s_i \right|. \quad (8)$$

Eq. 8 computes an auxiliary calibration loss by taking, over m samples in a minibatch, that penalizes the mismatch between observed mean correctness and mean confidence, thereby guiding the model to better align its confidence estimates with empirical accuracy, without strict constraint on each example. Note that during backpropagation, the gradients are backpropagated only through the confidence term s_i .

[-] Multi-class Difference-between-Confidence-Accuracy (MDCA). MDCA [27] generalizes DCA to the multi-class setting by evaluating calibration across all class probabilities, rather than only the predicted class. For each class j , the method computes the gap between the average one-hot ground-truth indicator $c_i[j]$ and the average predicted probability $s_i[j]$ over the dataset. Averaging these discrepancies across all C classes yields a calibration loss that captures class-specific trends in over- and under-confidence. MDCA thus provides a more fine-grained and stable calibration signal, which is particularly beneficial in settings with many classes or imbalanced prediction distributions. For a minibatch of size m ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mdca}} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{j=1}^C \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m c_i[j] - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m s_i[j] \right| \quad (9)$$

Eq. 9 extends the DCA concept to the multi-class setting by




Figure 7. **Effect of scaling the temperature hyperparameter** (τ). We report the results of (a) CIFAR-10 and (b) CIFAR-100 datasets, with ECE metric.

considering each class $j = 1, \dots, C$. For each class, it computes the difference between the average ground-truth indicator $c_i[j]$ (which equals 1 if sample i belongs to class j and 0 otherwise) and the average predicted probability $s_i[j]$ across all m samples in a minibatch. The loss is then averaged over all C classes, providing a fine-grained calibration signal that captures errors in predicted probabilities across the full class distribution.

Additional implementation details. In this paragraph, we elaborate on the implementation details, providing additional information beyond what is included in the main paper. In FL^2oRA , we only fine-tune the LoRA-adapted layers of the transformer blocks, while keeping all original weights frozen. Specifically, for both the image and text encoders, only the LoRA matrices W_A and W_B of the query, key, and value projections in the attention modules are trainable. All other parameters, including projection, MLP, and layer normalization weights, remain frozen to reduce memory footprint and improve training efficiency. We keep the rank of LoRA matrices to 2 and a dropout rate of 0.25 to regularize the input of the LoRA modules.

B. Additional empirical evaluation

In this section we report additional experimental analyses and detailed breakdown of the results presented in the main paper.

B.1. Effect of Temperature Scaling

In Figure 7, we show how the temperature hyperparameter τ effects the model calibration (ECE) on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets using the post-hoc calibration technique temperature scaling [23]. The results showcase moderate temperatures yield better calibration, while too small or too large τ harms it. ZS-CLIP is highly sensitive to τ as ECE improves markedly near $\tau = 0.5$ but degrades rapidly as τ increases, indicating that mild softening corrects overconfidence whereas excessive softening induces underconfident predictions. Among federated baselines, FedOTP and FedPGP tend to worsen as τ grows, suggesting a monotonic loss of calibration with over-smoothing, whereas PromptFL and FedPHA are comparatively stable with smaller ECE variation. However, our proposed FL^2oRA maintains both the lowest and most stable ECE over a wide range of τ , pointing to robustness to the temperature choice and reduced reliance on per-dataset tuning.

B.2. Additional calibration metrics

Following previous work on model calibration [46], we also report performance using two additional calibration metrics, Brier score

Table 8. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Results have been reported on the *in-distribution* setting using datasets: CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 in terms of **Brier score** [21] (Mean squared probability error), **NLL** [24] (Negative LogLikelihood).

Method	CIFAR-10		CIFAR-100	
	Brier score ↓	NLL ↓	Brier Score ↓	NLL ↓
ZS-CLIP [56]	0.17	0.37	0.48	1.40
FL setting (without calibration)				
PromptFL [25]	0.12	0.23	0.36	0.93
FedPGP [13]	0.13	0.28	0.42	1.12
FedOTP [40]	0.09	0.20	0.38	1.00
FedPHA [14]	0.10	0.20	0.35	0.91
$\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-text}$ (Ours)	0.11	0.23	0.36	0.90
$\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-vision}$ (Ours)	0.05	0.09	0.24	0.57
FL^2oRA (Ours)	0.05	0.10	0.50	1.43
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])				
PromptFL [25]	0.12	0.24	0.36	0.92
FedPGP [13]	0.13	0.28	0.38	1.00
FedOTP [40]	0.09	0.20	0.37	0.97
FedPHA [14]	0.10	0.20	0.34	0.90
$\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-text}$ (Ours)	0.11	0.23	0.36	0.90
$\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-vision}$ (Ours)	0.05	0.09	0.24	0.57
FL^2oRA (Ours)	0.05	0.09	0.23	0.52
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])				
PromptFL [25]	0.12	0.23	0.36	0.92
FedPGP [13]	0.14	0.30	0.38	0.98
FedOTP [40]	0.09	0.20	0.38	1.00
FedPHA [14]	0.10	0.20	0.34	0.91
$\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-text}$ (Ours)	0.11	0.23	0.36	0.90
$\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-vision}$ (Ours)	0.05	0.09	0.24	0.57
FL^2oRA (Ours)	0.05	0.09	0.23	0.52

and negative log-likelihood (NLL), which complement the three other metrics reported in the main paper. First, we describe the metrics, and then we present the results.

Brier score measures the mean squared error between predicted probabilities and one-hot labels. Given $|\mathcal{D}|$ examples and C classes, with i indexing examples and c indexing classes, let $y(i, c) \in \{0, 1\}$ denote the one-hot label (1 if $c = y(i)$, else 0) and $p(i, c) \in [0, 1]$ the predicted probability with $\sum_{c=1}^C p(i, c) = 1$. It can be defined as:

$$\text{Brier score} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{c=1}^C (p_{i,c} - y_{i,c})^2, \quad (10)$$

Lower Brier scores indicate better calibration, as the metric penalizes assigning probability mass to incorrect classes and rewards well-calibrated, appropriately uncertain predictions.

Negative log-likelihood (NLL) evaluates the average log probability assigned to the true class and strongly penalizes overconfident mistakes. Using the same notation above, with true class index y , it is defined as,

$$\text{NLL} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} \log(p_{i,y}), \quad (11)$$

Lower NLL corresponds to better calibration under the model’s predictive distribution. As an unbounded, strictly proper scoring rule aligned with maximum-likelihood training, NLL is particularly sensitive to the tails of the confidence distribution, distinguishing models that differ mainly in how confidently they handle ambiguous samples.

In Table 8, we present the detailed Brier score and NLL calibration results for the various FL^2oRA variants as well as the baseline methods. We observe that both FL^2oRA and $\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-vision}$ consistently achieve better calibration, while $\text{FL}^2\text{oRA-text}$ performs




Figure 8. **Effect of varying participation rates.** We report (a) Accuracy and (b) ECE metrics on OfficeHome dataset.




Figure 9. **Analysis of $|w_{zs} - w_{LoRA}|$ over each communication round.** We report the average results of all LoRA trainable encoder layers of each clients on (a) CIFAR-10 and (b) CIFAR-100 datasets.

comparably to the baselines. This is consistent with the findings in the main paper, where for all the calibration metrics, FL²oRA and its variants were better and/or competitive without needing extra regularization losses.

B.3. Impact of client participation rate

In Figure 8, we showcase the effect of participation rates of clients on accuracy and ECE for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. It indicates that increasing client participation generally improves accuracy for all federated methods, with gains tapering at higher rates, while ZS-CLIP has no effect of participation rates. However, our proposed FL²oRA consistently achieves the top accuracy across all participation levels and retains a clear margin even under sparse participation. Similarly, the calibration trends follow a similar pattern, where ECE metric is broadly stable or slightly decreases as participation rises. FL²oRA attains the lowest and most stable ECE, whereas alternatives such as PromptFL and FedPGP show mild, non-monotonic fluctuations.

B.4. Additional insights on improved calibration

In Section 4.4 of the main paper, we hypothesize that FL²oRA calibration gains stem from LoRA’s constrained weight updates: by preventing large shifts in weight norms and logit scales across clients, LoRA implicitly enhances the ensemble effect induced by FedAvg. Figure 9 empirically supports this hypothesis on CIFAR-10/100. Specifically, for each client, we measure the weight drift relative to the pretrained CLIP model before each communication round, averaging the drift over all LoRA layers. As shown in the figure, the inter-client standard deviation is negligible, indicating that LoRA indeed limits parameter drift and keeps logit scales stable.

B.5. Complexity analysis

In Figure 10, we qualitatively illustrate the trade-off between trainable parameters, accuracy, and ECE calibration on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, both without and with DCA. Here, the trainable parameters are defined by markers and the marker size depends on the number of the training parameters. The FL prompt tuning methods with moderate trainable parameters showcase substantial accuracy gains and noticeably lower ECE, showing strong returns for minimal complexity. However, the LoRA variants in our proposed FL²oRA push the frontier further. As the parameter budget increases (from text to vision and both), it moves toward higher accuracy and lower ECE, though improvements become incremental, indicating diminishing returns at the high-compute end. However, applying DCA on them showcase similar calibration. Finally, FL²oRA comes up with a trade-off between training parameter size and performance, but the improved calibration showcase a positive indication in the FL settings.

B.6. Detailed results of the main tables

In Table 9, 10 and 11, we provide the detailed results of individual datasets PACS, OfficeHome and VLCS respectively in the domain-generalization setting. The average results of them are reported in the Table. 4 of the main paper. Similarly in Table 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, we provide the detailed results of Food101, DTD, Caltech101, Flowers102, and OxfordPets datasets, corresponding to Table 5 of the main paper, for the base-to-new generalization setting.




Figure 10. **Comparison of number of trainable parameters.** We show the qualitative results of Accuracy vs. ECE metrics on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets, where the markers' size define the number of trainable parameters of each method.

Table 9. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *domain generalization* setting using the PACS dataset.

Method	Art Painting				Cartoon				Photo			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	98.82	3.22	2.13	3.12	93.91	2.84	1.43	2.65	99.28	3.62	1.23	3.60
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	98.83	0.95	0.40	0.48	99.20	0.98	0.42	0.31	99.89	0.55	0.24	0.38
FedPGP [13]	99.02	0.95	0.40	0.61	99.66	0.76	0.31	0.55	99.95	0.37	0.13	0.24
FedOTP [40]	98.34	4.04	1.62	3.98	99.04	3.68	1.55	3.58	99.80	2.22	1.38	2.15
FedPHA [14]	99.02	0.98	0.26	0.44	99.82	0.76	0.34	0.53	99.90	0.31	0.27	0.31
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	98.78	0.96	0.37	0.76	99.29	1.35	0.46	0.95	99.85	0.92	0.40	0.68
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	99.40	0.81	0.34	0.61	99.82	0.66	0.32	0.40	99.90	0.39	0.17	0.26
FL ² oRA (Ours)	99.41	0.57	0.20	0.36	99.93	0.69	0.28	0.42	99.85	0.49	0.18	0.23
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	98.68	1.15	0.42	0.70	99.27	1.15	0.40	0.52	99.89	0.75	0.35	0.42
FedPGP [13]	99.17	0.94	0.30	0.53	99.66	0.70	0.26	0.44	99.95	0.37	0.14	0.25
FedOTP [40]	98.53	3.42	1.38	3.37	98.89	2.78	1.33	2.68	99.79	1.78	1.10	1.70
FedPHA [14]	99.17	0.92	0.24	0.85	99.78	0.70	0.20	1.19	99.82	0.42	0.25	0.25
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	98.65	0.75	0.22	0.50	99.32	1.09	0.38	0.44	99.90	0.54	0.18	0.33
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	99.41	0.64	0.29	0.52	99.82	0.60	0.28	0.31	99.90	0.33	0.18	0.21
FL ² oRA (Ours)	99.41	0.62	0.17	0.30	99.86	0.59	0.24	0.30	99.85	0.45	0.16	0.17
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	98.73	0.84	0.26	0.44	99.32	0.63	0.28	0.35	99.89	0.45	0.19	0.25
FedPGP [13]	98.93	1.07	0.41	0.47	99.64	1.00	0.39	0.62	99.90	0.40	0.17	0.23
FedOTP [40]	98.39	4.01	1.59	3.96	98.95	3.60	1.57	3.51	99.80	2.16	1.37	2.08
FedPHA [14]	99.17	1.31	0.32	0.35	99.84	1.23	0.20	0.37	99.90	0.88	0.08	0.10
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	98.78	0.90	0.26	0.42	99.24	0.89	0.32	0.58	99.85	0.74	0.29	0.41
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	99.41	0.64	0.31	0.55	99.82	0.64	0.30	0.36	99.90	0.37	0.20	0.24
FL ² oRA (Ours)	99.41	0.55	0.17	0.36	99.93	0.56	0.25	0.38	99.90	0.43	0.18	0.26
Method	Sketch				Average							
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow				
ZS-CLIP [56]	90.99	6.41	2.38	6.58	95.75	4.02	1.80	3.99				
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	95.17	1.25	0.39	0.97	98.27	0.93	0.36	0.53				
FedPGP [13]	96.89	1.47	0.50	1.10	98.88	0.89	0.34	0.63				
FedOTP [40]	96.18	5.18	1.77	5.07	98.34	3.78	1.58	3.70				
FedPHA [14]	97.08	1.32	0.46	0.72	98.96	0.84	0.33	0.50				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	93.22	1.64	0.39	0.81	97.78	1.22	0.40	0.80				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	98.18	0.77	0.31	0.58	99.32	0.66	0.29	0.46				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	97.76	0.97	0.38	0.63	99.24	0.68	0.26	0.41				
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	95.30	1.51	0.49	1.46	98.29	1.14	0.42	0.78				
FedPGP [13]	96.58	1.17	0.48	0.71	98.84	0.80	0.30	0.48				
FedOTP [40]	96.00	4.00	1.58	3.92	98.30	3.00	1.35	2.92				
FedPHA [14]	97.20	1.03	0.33	0.84	98.99	0.77	0.26	0.78				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	94.10	1.18	0.32	0.91	97.99	0.89	0.28	0.55				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	98.03	0.78	0.32	0.59	99.29	0.59	0.27	0.41				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	97.76	0.81	0.32	0.60	99.22	0.62	0.22	0.34				
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	94.82	0.90	0.23	0.42	98.19	0.71	0.24	0.37				
FedPGP [13]	96.33	1.43	1.67	0.93	98.70	0.98	0.66	0.56				
FedOTP [40]	96.08	5.28	1.79	5.12	98.30	3.76	1.58	3.67				
FedPHA [14]	96.88	0.88	0.35	0.50	98.95	1.07	0.24	0.33				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	93.65	1.57	0.48	0.68	97.88	1.03	0.34	0.52				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	98.23	0.68	0.31	0.54	99.34	0.58	0.28	0.42				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	97.85	1.02	0.37	0.46	99.27	0.64	0.24	0.36				

Table 10. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *domain generalization* setting using the OfficeHome dataset.

Method	Art				Clipart				Product			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	83.95	10.26	1.96	8.72	65.45	5.86	1.24	6.12	89.30	3.49	1.18	3.50
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	87.55	3.83	1.00	3.96	75.35	3.57	1.13	3.27	93.85	2.00	0.60	1.51
FedPGP [13]	89.10	5.32	1.24	3.74	78.55	4.24	1.21	3.19	95.50	2.84	0.71	1.78
FedOTP [40]	81.95	23.56	5.48	23.43	77.15	17.57	3.25	17.53	92.40	21.04	3.45	21.00
FedPHA [14]	88.05	3.36	0.77	2.60	81.35	3.07	0.76	2.88	96.00	1.85	0.57	1.09
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	87.52	3.68	0.83	3.00	75.65	4.09	0.92	4.50	94.94	2.89	0.77	2.16
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	87.94	3.27	1.00	2.27	81.15	2.89	1.18	2.69	94.21	1.51	0.69	1.60
FL ² oRA (Ours)	89.39	4.73	1.09	1.86	82.08	3.76	1.08	2.76	94.38	2.28	0.70	1.24
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	86.55	3.49	0.97	3.12	76.55	4.86	1.19	3.57	94.44	2.25	0.58	1.50
FedPGP [13]	88.79	5.44	1.15	4.34	78.48	3.84	0.95	2.72	95.92	2.04	0.50	1.64
FedOTP [40]	80.95	18.76	4.07	18.70	76.43	13.07	2.62	12.90	91.92	16.66	2.69	16.64
FedPHA [14]	87.70	4.22	0.93	3.82	80.80	3.64	0.87	2.96	95.93	1.94	0.52	1.99
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	88.36	3.64	0.91	2.92	76.14	3.59	1.06	3.02	95.17	2.16	0.66	1.87
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	88.49	3.97	1.24	3.33	80.97	4.55	1.35	3.53	94.32	2.16	0.76	1.83
FL ² oRA (Ours)	88.90	2.59	0.82	3.32	82.35	2.68	0.84	2.28	93.82	2.08	0.48	1.98
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	86.55	4.47	1.19	2.96	75.34	3.81	0.81	3.02	94.13	1.88	0.63	1.35
FedPGP [13]	88.18	3.57	0.91	3.46	78.65	4.89	1.76	3.61	95.93	3.15	0.76	2.32
FedOTP [40]	82.28	23.86	6.32	23.66	77.50	18.06	3.75	17.97	92.19	20.59	3.16	20.55
FedPHA [14]	89.27	2.81	0.78	2.09	80.62	3.63	1.06	4.16	95.73	1.26	0.44	1.26
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	87.52	3.50	0.93	3.02	75.55	4.32	0.92	4.00	94.94	2.58	0.75	2.10
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	87.94	3.51	1.11	2.16	80.92	3.33	1.17	2.29	94.21	1.54	0.55	1.61
FL ² oRA (Ours)	89.39	4.91	1.17	2.23	81.83	3.40	1.07	2.60	94.38	2.30	0.74	1.25
Method	Real World				Average							
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow				
ZS-CLIP [56]	90.25	5.15	1.47	4.96	82.24	6.19	1.46	5.82				
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	93.00	1.81	0.62	1.71	87.44	2.80	0.84	2.61				
FedPGP [13]	93.95	3.51	0.84	2.17	89.28	3.98	1.00	2.72				
FedOTP [40]	88.00	16.38	2.65	16.38	84.88	19.64	3.71	19.59				
FedPHA [14]	93.50	2.32	0.80	1.64	89.73	2.65	0.73	2.05				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	93.45	2.96	0.87	2.56	87.89	3.41	0.85	3.06				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	92.96	2.37	0.85	2.17	89.06	2.51	0.93	2.18				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	93.14	1.64	0.47	1.58	89.75	3.10	0.83	1.86				
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	93.76	2.24	0.69	2.26	87.83	3.21	0.86	2.61				
FedPGP [13]	93.83	2.47	0.90	2.06	89.25	3.45	0.87	2.69				
FedOTP [40]	87.15	12.89	2.26	12.86	84.11	15.35	2.91	15.28				
FedPHA [14]	92.82	2.95	0.91	2.66	89.31	3.19	0.81	2.86				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	93.38	2.72	0.81	2.30	88.26	3.03	0.86	2.53				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	92.97	2.23	0.52	1.92	89.19	3.23	0.97	2.65				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	92.66	1.99	0.49	1.33	89.43	2.34	0.66	2.23				
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	93.97	2.56	0.63	2.63	87.50	3.18	0.82	2.49				
FedPGP [13]	94.40	3.23	0.77	3.12	89.29	3.71	1.05	3.13				
FedOTP [40]	87.64	16.21	2.92	16.21	84.90	19.68	4.04	19.60				
FedPHA [14]	93.93	2.40	0.69	1.79	89.89	2.53	0.74	2.33				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	93.56	2.75	0.84	2.64	87.89	3.29	0.86	2.94				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	93.08	2.30	0.71	2.26	89.04	2.67	0.89	2.08				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	93.03	1.46	0.47	1.47	89.66	3.02	0.86	1.89				

Table 11. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *domain generalization* setting using the VLCS dataset.

Method	Caltech				Labelme				Pascal-VOC			
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow
ZS-CLIP [56]	78.44	10.36	4.56	10.53	84.65	6.40	2.41	6.64	87.94	7.51	1.75	8.24
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	100.00	2.22	1.83	2.15	78.24	10.11	4.84	11.67	89.27	2.70	1.19	2.58
FedPGP [13]	100.00	2.30	1.23	2.25	81.37	4.87	2.09	5.68	90.77	2.06	1.07	2.30
FedOTP [40]	100.00	2.80	1.82	2.80	81.96	6.20	2.13	6.08	90.58	6.21	1.80	5.59
FedPHA [14]	100.00	2.51	1.18	2.39	81.98	4.85	1.92	5.40	90.67	2.11	0.88	1.82
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	100.00	2.64	2.32	2.64	80.40	4.47	1.23	5.00	90.41	3.96	1.38	3.62
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	99.64	1.80	0.97	1.50	83.27	7.00	2.38	6.63	90.99	2.31	0.64	2.47
FL ² oRA (Ours)	100.00	2.04	1.20	2.01	81.57	5.79	1.84	5.25	91.06	2.59	1.09	2.27
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	100.00	2.28	1.78	2.23	78.34	8.90	4.69	10.27	90.61	2.77	0.82	2.59
FedPGP [13]	100.00	0.22	0.13	0.13	86.20	6.32	1.96	6.55	95.85	1.72	0.69	2.34
FedOTP [40]	100.00	2.14	1.45	2.14	82.65	5.00	1.40	4.75	94.50	5.24	1.53	4.50
FedPHA [14]	100.00	0.32	0.11	0.14	86.53	4.54	1.34	5.05	94.82	1.62	0.52	1.55
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	100.00	2.06	1.86	2.05	77.83	5.56	2.24	7.24	90.43	3.59	1.24	3.06
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	99.64	1.74	0.85	1.33	82.70	7.71	2.58	6.71	90.86	2.59	0.83	2.10
FL ² oRA (Ours)	100.00	2.18	1.10	2.16	83.16	5.31	1.65	4.88	90.67	3.20	1.38	2.67
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	100.00	2.00	1.69	1.99	79.68	8.37	4.52	9.55	90.91	2.46	0.75	3.30
FedPGP [13]	100.00	0.27	0.21	0.21	87.91	3.26	1.31	4.62	95.59	1.63	0.69	1.36
FedOTP [40]	100.00	2.85	1.72	2.85	83.89	5.87	1.58	6.32	94.37	5.89	1.67	5.45
FedPHA [14]	100.00	1.98	1.77	1.79	86.64	4.05	2.51	3.92	94.72	2.66	1.61	2.66
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	100.00	1.36	1.26	1.31	79.03	5.55	2.24	6.29	91.18	2.57	0.82	2.69
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	99.64	1.74	0.94	1.43	82.29	5.73	2.28	6.26	91.43	2.02	0.62	2.02
FL ² oRA (Ours)	99.82	1.97	1.13	1.96	82.55	5.39	2.01	4.24	91.06	2.44	0.75	2.34
Method	Sun				Average							
	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow	Acc. \uparrow	ECE \downarrow	MCE \downarrow	ACE \downarrow				
ZS-CLIP [56]	80.78	3.95	1.45	4.22	82.95	7.06	2.54	7.41				
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	84.63	4.53	1.89	4.45	88.03	4.89	2.44	5.21				
FedPGP [13]	87.81	3.32	0.87	3.25	89.99	3.14	1.32	3.37				
FedOTP [40]	87.38	3.19	1.46	2.85	89.98	4.60	1.80	4.33				
FedPHA [14]	87.06	4.04	1.49	3.67	89.93	3.38	1.37	3.32				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	84.43	4.46	1.48	4.33	88.81	3.88	1.60	3.90				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	87.74	2.92	1.18	2.59	90.41	3.51	1.29	3.30				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	88.77	2.88	1.01	3.31	90.35	3.33	1.29	3.21				
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	82.49	5.51	2.23	5.84	87.86	4.87	2.38	5.23				
FedPGP [13]	92.79	2.10	0.71	2.96	93.71	2.59	0.87	3.00				
FedOTP [40]	91.62	2.67	1.34	3.10	92.19	3.76	1.43	3.62				
FedPHA [14]	92.59	3.69	1.44	3.00	93.49	2.54	0.85	2.44				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	83.58	4.71	1.72	5.02	87.96	3.98	1.77	4.34				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	87.52	3.39	1.08	2.16	90.18	3.86	1.34	3.08				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	89.17	2.61	1.01	3.41	90.75	3.33	1.29	3.28				
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	82.49	6.59	3.37	6.96	88.27	4.85	2.58	5.45				
FedPGP [13]	93.08	3.54	1.73	1.79	94.14	2.17	0.98	2.00				
FedOTP [40]	91.45	2.72	1.31	3.22	92.43	4.33	1.57	4.46				
FedPHA [14]	91.99	3.69	1.48	3.01	93.34	3.10	1.84	2.85				
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	84.19	3.26	1.03	3.99	88.60	3.18	1.34	3.57				
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	88.22	2.65	1.11	3.20	90.40	3.04	1.24	3.23				
FL ² oRA (Ours)	87.71	2.44	0.90	2.13	90.28	3.06	1.20	2.67				

Table 12. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *base-to-new generalization* setting using the Food101 dataset.

Method	Acc. \uparrow			ECE \downarrow			MCE \downarrow			ACE \downarrow		
	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM
ZS-CLIP [56]	90.29	91.70	90.99	2.38	2.90	2.61	0.76	0.82	0.79	2.38	2.90	2.61
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	89.78	90.79	90.28	0.48	0.70	0.57	0.13	0.17	0.15	0.39	0.61	0.47
FedPGP [13]	87.54	87.94	87.74	1.19	1.08	1.13	0.38	0.35	0.37	1.16	1.02	1.09
FedOTP [40]	15.18	40.18	22.03	39.93	17.49	24.32	8.05	4.02	5.36	39.93	17.48	24.31
FedPHA [14]	58.11	70.69	63.79	19.21	7.56	10.85	7.37	2.78	4.04	18.19	7.31	10.43
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	90.06	91.23	90.64	0.49	0.56	0.52	0.15	0.19	0.17	0.37	0.52	0.43
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	89.29	90.58	89.93	1.14	0.74	0.90	0.30	0.22	0.25	1.21	0.67	0.86
FL ² oRA (Ours)	89.34	89.83	89.58	1.95	1.12	1.42	0.62	0.29	0.39	1.81	1.03	1.31
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	89.87	91.11	90.49	0.57	0.89	0.70	0.10	0.30	0.15	0.58	0.83	0.68
FedPGP [13]	85.46	86.16	85.81	2.72	0.99	1.45	0.99	0.33	0.50	2.68	0.92	1.37
FedOTP [40]	14.08	38.27	20.59	44.94	20.15	27.83	8.26	5.34	6.49	44.93	20.13	27.80
FedPHA [14]	54.03	69.22	60.69	25.12	9.76	14.06	9.79	3.13	4.74	23.47	9.40	13.42
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	90.13	91.24	90.68	0.66	0.46	0.54	0.18	0.12	0.14	0.64	0.36	0.46
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	89.22	90.54	89.87	1.75	0.55	0.84	0.36	0.15	0.21	1.73	0.53	0.81
FL ² oRA (Ours)	89.21	89.82	89.51	2.46	1.46	1.83	0.81	0.38	0.52	2.25	1.37	1.70
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	89.81	90.60	90.20	0.39	0.81	0.53	0.11	0.27	0.16	0.45	0.77	0.57
FedPGP [13]	87.54	87.94	87.74	1.19	1.08	1.13	0.38	0.35	0.36	1.16	1.02	1.08
FedOTP [40]	18.91	40.78	25.84	35.79	13.38	19.48	7.18	2.84	4.07	35.79	13.38	19.48
FedPHA [14]	50.77	60.46	55.19	26.35	17.71	21.18	10.07	6.04	7.55	24.84	17.14	20.28
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	90.08	91.28	90.68	0.51	0.47	0.49	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.36	0.49	0.42
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	89.26	90.52	89.89	1.23	0.72	0.91	0.33	0.20	0.25	1.26	0.67	0.87
FL ² oRA (Ours)	89.35	89.81	89.58	2.01	1.17	1.48	0.64	0.30	0.41	1.86	1.10	1.38

Table 13. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *base-to-new generalization* setting using the DTD dataset.

Method	Acc. \uparrow			ECE \downarrow			MCE \downarrow			ACE \downarrow		
	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM
ZS-CLIP [56]	53.70	54.23	53.96	5.90	8.47	6.96	1.49	2.97	1.98	6.85	9.88	8.09
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	76.85	44.93	56.71	6.72	24.65	10.56	2.32	7.38	3.54	6.35	24.65	10.10
FedPGP [13]	67.88	50.87	58.16	13.98	19.19	16.18	5.88	4.27	4.95	13.88	19.12	16.08
FedOTP [40]	27.65	42.17	33.40	41.26	13.68	20.55	11.00	2.95	4.66	41.04	13.71	20.55
FedPHA [14]	27.87	38.29	32.26	50.52	20.53	29.20	25.81	4.50	7.67	48.96	20.50	28.90
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	79.51	58.49	67.40	5.36	16.78	8.12	1.62	4.80	2.42	4.91	16.25	7.54
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	81.34	48.59	60.84	6.97	17.14	9.91	1.81	3.89	2.47	7.45	16.95	10.35
FL ² oRA (Ours)	82.63	55.59	66.47	8.45	26.27	12.79	3.12	10.45	4.81	7.09	23.35	10.88
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	78.59	51.21	62.01	6.78	20.79	10.23	1.93	5.32	2.83	6.41	20.79	9.80
FedPGP [13]	69.84	53.85	60.81	10.94	12.93	11.85	3.65	2.62	3.05	10.77	12.85	11.72
FedOTP [40]	22.66	42.13	29.47	50.82	16.65	25.09	16.58	4.04	6.50	50.52	16.70	25.11
FedPHA [14]	25.81	39.55	31.24	53.81	20.70	29.90	27.74	5.39	9.03	51.43	20.44	29.26
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	79.27	58.00	66.99	6.47	16.98	9.37	2.05	5.37	2.97	5.98	16.06	8.72
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	81.92	48.50	60.93	3.81	19.14	6.35	1.16	4.38	1.83	4.83	18.81	7.68
FL ² oRA (Ours)	82.85	55.98	66.81	9.91	26.80	14.47	4.08	11.01	5.95	8.26	23.32	12.20
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	76.62	53.86	63.26	7.17	17.06	10.10	2.37	4.10	3.00	6.71	16.75	9.58
FedPGP [13]	74.72	48.54	58.85	7.88	19.95	11.30	3.34	3.91	3.60	7.63	19.85	11.02
FedOTP [40]	29.10	44.70	35.25	39.73	10.15	16.17	11.06	2.19	3.66	39.45	10.13	16.12
FedPHA [14]	26.47	37.40	31.00	52.05	23.25	32.14	25.88	5.45	9.01	50.00	23.00	31.51
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	79.78	55.62	65.54	4.91	17.38	7.66	1.50	3.97	2.18	4.61	17.03	7.26
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	81.60	48.66	60.96	6.63	17.27	9.58	1.79	3.95	2.46	7.24	17.07	10.17
FL ² oRA (Ours)	82.47	56.11	66.78	9.05	26.77	13.53	3.74	10.69	5.54	7.69	23.97	11.64

Table 14. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *base-to-new generalization* setting using the Caltech101 dataset.

Method	Acc. \uparrow			ECE \downarrow			MCE \downarrow			ACE \downarrow		
	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM
ZS-CLIP [56]	95.93	93.34	94.62	7.41	3.34	4.60	1.50	2.55	1.89	7.41	2.68	3.94
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	97.55	92.36	94.88	0.77	4.41	1.31	0.21	3.77	0.40	0.36	4.89	0.67
FedPGP [13]	96.36	92.43	94.36	1.39	4.08	2.07	0.62	3.01	1.03	0.87	3.64	1.40
FedOTP [40]	38.97	67.98	49.54	18.51	11.40	14.11	3.68	2.61	3.05	18.68	11.31	14.09
FedPHA [14]	82.15	87.03	84.52	5.42	5.55	5.48	1.95	2.75	2.28	5.16	4.75	4.95
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	98.17	93.32	95.68	1.62	2.92	2.08	0.58	1.07	0.75	1.17	2.44	1.58
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	98.40	92.78	95.51	2.91	7.21	4.15	0.91	3.57	1.46	2.62	4.09	3.20
FL ² oRA (Ours)	98.34	93.41	95.81	1.34	3.33	1.91	0.44	1.17	0.64	0.84	2.51	1.26
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	97.09	92.03	94.49	1.56	4.87	2.36	0.89	4.24	1.47	1.08	4.29	1.73
FedPGP [13]	96.95	92.98	94.93	1.01	3.89	1.60	0.41	2.75	0.71	0.82	3.26	1.31
FedOTP [40]	42.63	66.62	51.99	19.08	7.75	11.02	3.87	1.95	2.59	19.13	7.84	11.12
FedPHA [14]	78.78	87.05	82.71	8.54	6.13	7.14	4.03	3.06	3.48	8.05	5.04	6.20
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	98.17	93.61	95.84	1.33	2.80	1.80	0.49	0.92	0.64	0.91	2.18	1.28
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	98.41	92.82	95.53	2.32	6.57	3.43	0.84	3.75	1.37	1.95	4.15	2.65
FL ² oRA (Ours)	98.30	93.33	95.75	1.20	3.44	1.78	0.39	1.05	0.57	0.60	2.67	0.98
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	97.03	92.58	94.75	1.20	4.40	1.89	0.37	3.35	0.67	0.55	3.58	0.95
FedPGP [13]	96.45	92.45	94.40	1.30	2.63	1.74	0.65	1.09	0.81	1.00	2.40	1.41
FedOTP [40]	31.80	68.20	43.38	26.03	12.32	16.72	5.35	2.95	3.80	25.99	12.23	16.63
FedPHA [14]	78.68	84.12	81.31	7.86	6.60	7.18	2.86	2.77	2.81	7.46	5.39	6.26
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	98.17	93.45	95.75	1.62	2.65	2.01	0.57	0.90	0.70	1.13	2.20	1.49
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	98.36	92.79	95.50	2.76	6.18	3.82	0.90	3.59	1.44	2.50	4.12	3.11
FL ² oRA (Ours)	98.36	93.43	95.83	1.30	3.35	1.87	0.43	1.23	0.64	0.83	2.49	1.24

Table 15. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *base-to-new generalization* setting using the Flowers102 dataset.

Method	Acc. \uparrow			ECE \downarrow			MCE \downarrow			ACE \downarrow		
	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM
ZS-CLIP [56]	73.22	77.94	75.51	4.83	4.45	4.63	1.38	0.94	1.12	5.20	4.89	5.04
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	95.82	64.26	76.93	3.05	15.74	5.11	1.04	3.89	1.64	2.91	15.74	4.91
FedPGP [13]	73.79	65.21	69.24	7.53	10.88	8.90	3.24	2.66	2.92	7.41	10.86	8.81
FedOTP [40]	15.15	32.85	20.73	46.74	13.96	21.50	9.81	3.28	4.91	46.72	14.09	21.65
FedPHA [14]	29.43	49.37	36.88	48.27	16.31	24.38	21.26	3.57	6.11	45.80	16.28	24.02
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	97.63	72.67	83.32	3.51	9.02	5.05	1.25	1.95	1.52	3.26	9.02	4.79
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	96.32	68.35	79.96	3.46	15.94	5.69	1.35	4.91	2.12	3.06	15.26	5.10
FL ² oRA (Ours)	98.01	72.27	83.19	1.44	15.23	2.63	0.46	5.72	0.85	1.02	14.47	1.90
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	94.68	66.74	78.29	2.69	11.13	4.33	0.97	2.16	1.33	2.32	11.14	3.84
FedPGP [13]	70.77	64.21	67.33	11.15	14.53	12.62	4.90	3.79	4.27	11.04	14.52	12.54
FedOTP [40]	14.01	28.67	18.82	53.06	22.78	31.88	13.38	5.57	7.86	53.06	22.93	32.02
FedPHA [14]	29.05	47.58	36.08	50.91	20.96	29.69	22.98	4.47	7.49	47.93	20.96	29.17
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	97.86	73.52	83.97	3.18	9.06	4.71	1.21	2.18	1.56	2.96	2.94	2.95
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	96.26	68.20	79.83	2.44	16.82	4.26	0.92	5.38	1.57	2.07	15.89	3.66
FL ² oRA (Ours)	97.83	70.65	82.05	1.07	16.88	2.01	0.34	6.55	0.65	0.60	15.82	1.16
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	95.16	67.30	78.84	3.32	11.70	5.18	1.07	2.77	1.54	3.15	11.71	4.96
FedPGP [13]	74.97	66.35	70.40	7.59	9.26	8.34	3.02	2.24	2.57	7.63	9.32	8.39
FedOTP [40]	13.92	24.50	17.75	51.17	26.85	35.22	11.34	6.65	8.39	51.16	26.75	35.13
FedPHA [14]	29.01	45.74	35.50	49.52	21.80	30.27	22.22	5.88	9.30	46.80	21.70	29.65
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	97.62	72.42	83.15	3.37	9.04	4.91	1.28	2.06	1.58	3.18	9.05	4.71
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	96.45	68.12	79.85	3.42	16.24	5.65	1.35	4.95	2.12	3.06	15.55	5.11
FL ² oRA (Ours)	98.02	72.49	83.35	1.37	15.13	2.51	0.43	5.70	0.80	0.98	14.36	1.83

Table 16. **Comparison of federated CLIP fine-tuning methods.** Performances have been reported on the *base-to-new generalization* setting using the OxfordPets dataset.

Method	Acc. \uparrow			ECE \downarrow			MCE \downarrow			ACE \downarrow		
	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM	Base	New	HM
ZS-CLIP [56]	92.88	97.60	95.18	4.39	3.36	3.81	1.36	1.35	1.36	4.27	3.37	3.77
FL setting (without calibration)												
PromptFL [25]	95.48	96.76	96.12	2.85	3.13	2.98	0.79	0.91	0.85	2.78	3.13	2.95
FedPGP [13]	94.86	97.12	95.98	2.08	3.37	2.57	0.86	1.42	1.07	2.00	3.25	2.48
FedOTP [40]	13.86	52.07	21.89	64.69	18.64	28.94	26.50	4.13	7.15	64.55	18.63	28.91
FedPHA [14]	44.75	80.04	57.40	36.96	5.96	10.26	20.54	1.69	3.12	33.76	5.96	10.13
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	94.98	97.96	96.45	1.74	2.70	2.12	0.64	0.96	0.77	1.33	2.41	1.71
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	95.02	96.40	95.70	1.00	1.10	1.05	0.38	0.35	0.36	0.77	0.79	0.78
FL ² oRA (Ours)	95.16	97.29	96.22	0.60	1.24	0.81	0.33	0.41	0.37	0.66	0.69	0.67
FL setting (with calibration: DCA [42])												
PromptFL [25]	95.37	96.59	95.98	2.25	2.19	2.22	0.65	0.75	0.70	2.24	1.90	2.06
FedPGP [13]	94.05	97.21	95.60	1.11	2.78	1.59	0.38	1.06	0.56	1.08	2.64	1.53
FedOTP [40]	14.33	50.29	22.31	63.71	26.13	37.06	27.50	8.75	13.28	63.60	26.19	37.10
FedPHA [14]	51.62	77.82	62.07	29.78	5.22	8.88	17.39	1.60	2.93	27.62	5.27	8.85
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	95.08	98.03	96.53	1.31	2.60	1.74	0.54	0.93	0.68	1.05	2.36	1.45
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	95.01	95.78	95.39	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.51	0.55	0.53
FL ² oRA (Ours)	95.35	97.22	96.28	0.98	0.93	0.95	0.42	0.30	0.35	0.69	0.48	0.57
FL setting (with calibration: MDCA [27])												
PromptFL [25]	95.37	96.76	96.06	2.59	2.64	2.61	0.72	0.87	0.79	2.55	2.64	2.59
FedPGP [13]	95.02	97.29	96.14	1.85	2.60	2.16	0.80	1.02	0.90	1.77	2.56	2.09
FedOTP [40]	13.08	46.77	20.45	64.72	28.09	39.18	25.73	7.28	11.35	64.66	28.19	39.26
FedPHA [14]	46.56	79.30	58.67	33.12	7.30	11.96	18.36	2.56	4.49	30.86	7.14	11.60
FL ² oRA-text (Ours)	95.06	97.91	96.46	1.65	2.59	2.02	0.61	0.94	0.74	1.29	2.34	1.66
FL ² oRA-vision (Ours)	95.06	96.24	95.64	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.80	0.64	0.71
FL ² oRA (Ours)	95.10	97.28	96.17	1.03	1.18	1.10	0.38	0.39	0.39	0.72	0.63	0.67