

Geometric Prior-Guided Federated Prompt Calibration

Fei Luo¹, Ziwei Zhao², Mingxuan Wang³, Duoyang Li⁴, Zhe Qian⁵,
Jiayi Tuo⁶, Chenyue Zhou⁷, Yanbiao Ma^{3*}

¹Jishou University, ²Technical University of Munich, ³Renmin University of China,

⁴Northwestern Polytechnical University, ⁵South China Agricultural University,

⁶University of Science and Technology of China,

⁷Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics

Abstract

Federated Prompt Learning (FPL) offers a parameter-efficient solution for collaboratively training large models, but its performance is severely hindered by data heterogeneity, which causes locally trained prompts to become biased. Existing methods, focusing on aggregation or regularization, fail to address this root cause of local training bias. To this end, we propose Geometry-Guided Text Prompt Calibration (GGTPC), a novel framework that directly corrects this bias by providing clients with a global geometric prior. This prior, representing the shape of the global data distribution derived from the covariance matrix, is reconstructed on the server in a privacy-preserving manner. Clients then use a novel Geometry-Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL) to align their local feature distributions with this global prior during training. Extensive experiments show GGTPC’s effectiveness. On the label-skewed CIFAR-100 dataset ($\beta=0.1$), it outperforms the state-of-the-art by 2.15%. Under extreme skew ($\beta=0.01$), it improves upon the baseline by 9.17%. Furthermore, as a plug-and-play module on the domain-skewed Office-Home dataset, it boosts FedAvg’s performance by 4.60%. These results demonstrate that GGTPC effectively mitigates data heterogeneity by correcting the fundamental local training bias, serving as a versatile module to enhance various FL algorithms.

1 Introduction

Federated Learning (FL) has garnered significant attention from both academia and industry for its ability to collaboratively train shared global models across multiple clients while preserving local data privacy[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. In recent years, visual foundation models like CLIP[8], BLIP[9] and BLIP2[10] have achieved breakthroughs across numerous visual tasks due to their robust generalization capabilities. Consequently, securely and efficiently integrating such models into federated learning frameworks has emerged as a critical research direction[11, 12]. However, directly fine-tuning these large scale models on clients incurs substantial computational and communication overhead. To address this, parameter-efficient alternatives like Federated Prompt Learning (FPL) have emerged [12, 13, 14]. This approach significantly boosts training efficiency by communicating and aggregating only lightweight prompt vectors across clients, rapidly becoming a research hotspot in parameter-efficient federated learning. Recent surveys and domain deployments further illustrate FL’s breadth across robust training, continual on-device learning, sequential recommendation, oncology data sharing, and scientific collaboration ecosystems[15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

Despite its promising prospects, the core challenge of federated prompt learning is the widespread data heterogeneity among clients[20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. This stems from the intrinsic mechanism of prompt learning: the method aims to find optimal prompts that center text embeddings precisely

*Corresponding author. Email: ybma1998@ruc.edu.cn

around the global visual feature center. In a federated setting, however, each client’s data distribution is often biased (e.g. containing only partial categories or exhibiting severe class imbalance), resulting in a significant discrepancy between local data and the ideal global distribution[25]. When clients train prompts based solely on their own biased local data, the resulting text prompts inevitably deviate from the true global visual center. This performance degradation, caused by aggregating locally biased updates, severely limits the practical application of federated prompt learning[26, 27].

To address the aforementioned issues, we propose a direct solution: guiding clients towards unbiased local calibration by providing them with prior knowledge of the global data distribution in a privacy-preserving manner. This avoids optimization within the limited scope of local data. The core idea is to leverage the geometric properties of the embedding distribution to efficiently quantify and transmit this global prior information. Specifically, we define the geometric shape of each category in the embedding space as its primary data distribution direction (the eigenvector of the covariance matrix) and the extent to which it spreads across directions (the corresponding eigenvalue). This geometric prior accurately captures the intrinsic structure of the global data and inherently protects privacy, as its transmission involves no raw data.

Based on the aforementioned core principles, we propose a novel framework called Geometry-Guided Text Prompt Calibration (GGTPC). This framework comprises two key steps. First, a privacy-preserving aggregation strategy is designed on the server side. This involves collecting partial data to enrich the client’s local statistical information (mean vectors and covariance matrices) in order to reconstruct an approximation of the global covariance matrix for each category, from which global geometric priors are extracted. Secondly, an innovative GeometryPrior Calibration Layer (GPCL) is introduced on the client side. This module performs random transformations on local visual embeddings within the feature space under the guidance of global geometric priors to avoid complex sample generation, thereby better aligning their distributions with the ideal global distribution. This process optimizes text prompts towards unbiased global centers and integrates seamlessly into training workflows, enabling efficient end-to-end calibration.

The main contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Novel Calibration Perspective:** We propose addressing data heterogeneity in FPL from the perspective of text prompt embedding calibration for the first time. By introducing global geometric priors to correct local training bias, we provide a new research direction for this field.
- **Efficient Calibration Module:** We design a sample-generation-free Geometric Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL), which, combined with an inverse frequency sampling strategy, achieves efficient end-to-end unbiased calibration while effectively mitigating local class imbalance.
- **Versatility and Compatibility:** We verify that the proposed GGTPC method can serve as a plug-and-play module, seamlessly integrating into various mainstream federated learning algorithms and consistently improving their performance across different data heterogeneity scenarios, demonstrating its broad applicability and practical value.

2 Related Work

2.1 Data Heterogeneity in Federated Learning

The objective of federated learning (FL) is to collectively construct a robust global model without necessitating the sharing of local data by clients. However, in practical applications, data across clients is often non-IID (non-Independent and Identically Distributed), a phenomenon known as data heterogeneity[20, 22, 23]. This fundamental challenge gives rise to discrepancies between local model updates and the global optimization objective, with the potential to impede the convergence speed and ultimate performance of the global model to a considerable degree[21, 2].

To address this challenge, existing research primarily follows two technical approaches. The first category comprises client-side regularization methods, which introduce additional constraints during local training to reduce discrepancies between local and global models. For instance, FedProx[21] incorporates a proximity term to limit the magnitude of local updates, while SCAFFOLD[28] introduces control variables to mitigate “client drift” in local training. The second category focuses

on server-side aggregation optimization, aiming to design smarter aggregation schemes to replace the naive FedAvg[1]. For instance, FedOPT[29] applies principles from adaptive optimizers like Adam to the server-side model aggregation process, dynamically adjusting global model updates, while FedNova[30] and FedDC[31] correct objective inconsistency and decouple local drift for non-IID data. While these methods have achieved significant success in traditional federated learning models, they typically operate on the entire set of model parameters. When applied directly to vision foundation models with billions of parameters, they impose substantial computational and communication burdens, prompting researchers to explore more parameter-efficient federated learning paradigms.

Beyond these representative baselines, recent studies explore cross-model aggregation and adaptive mutation to further counter non-IID effects, including stochastic mutation, multi-model cross-aggregation, and layer-wise recombination across models[32, 33, 34, 35]. Prototype- or curriculum-based calibration offers another path by distilling or clustering global knowledge to correct local bias[36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41], while personalized objectives strive to jointly improve global generalization and client-specific performance[42].

Parallel efforts focus on federated out-of-distribution and domain-generalized learning. Geometric alignment and causal intervention ideas[43, 44, 45, 46, 47] are complemented by prototype-based domain adaptation and graph transfer learning tailored to skewed distributions[48, 49, 50, 51]. These advances underscore the importance of explicitly aligning local representations to a reliable global structure, motivating our geometric-prior-guided calibration.

2.2 Prompt Learning in Vision-Language Models

Prompt Learning has emerged as a novel Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) technique, offering a lightweight solution for adapting large scale vision-language models (VLMs) to downstream tasks[52, 53, 54]. The fundamental principle of this approach entails the freezing of the majority of the parameters of a pre-trained model, whilst task execution is guided exclusively by the optimization of a small number of learnable prompt vectors.

CoOp[52] first proposed learning continuous text prompt vectors to better adapt to downstream visual classification tasks. To address CoOp’s insufficient generalization on new categories, CoCoOp[55] further introduced a meta-network to dynamically generate instance-conditional prompts, enhancing the model’s generalization capability. Subsequent research has extended and refined prompt learning from various perspectives. For instance, MaPLE[54] explored joint prompting for visual and linguistic branches to achieve multimodal synergy. Other works like LASP[56] and KgCoOp[57] focused on incorporating external knowledge or structural information into prompts for more robust performance, while recent approaches such as DePT[58] and interactive prompting[59] further improve generalization via decoupled or multimodal prompt designs. However, these methods were developed under centralized settings, fundamentally assuming access to a complete dataset representing the global distribution. Consequently, they failed to address the challenge of learning unbiased prompts when data is distributed and heterogeneous.

2.3 Federated Prompt Learning

Federated Prompt Learning (FPL) aims to combine the parameter efficiency of prompt learning with the privacy protection advantages of federated learning. PromptFL[12] pioneered the introduction of prompt modules into federated systems, replacing traditional model fine-tuning with collaborative training using textual prompts. Subsequent work has largely focused on optimizing prompts across different modalities. In the realm of visual prompts, methods like FedVPT[60], FedPR[14] and FedCLIP[11] explored learning client-specific or shared prompts within federated frameworks. For textual prompts, FedTPG[13] designed a unified cross-client prompt generation network to learn more generalizable global prompts. While these approaches have advanced federated prompt learning, they primarily focus on refining aggregation strategies or designing novel prompt modules, often overlooking the fundamental issue stemming from data heterogeneity: due to significant distribution shifts between local and global data, prompts learned locally by clients are inherently biased. Existing methods fail to directly address this local training bias arising from distribution shifts.

In stark contrast to all the aforementioned approaches, the GGTPC framework proposed in this paper tackles the problem from a fundamentally different angle. Rather than focusing solely on improving aggregation algorithms or regularization terms, we directly confront the inherent distributional bias

within the local training process. The core contribution of this paper is the pioneering proposal of privately transmitting a global geometric prior of the data distribution to each client. This enables clients to locally simulate a quasi-global, unbiased distributional environment. Consequently, it allows for direct calibration of the learning objectives for text prompts, fundamentally aligning them with the true global visual center.

3 Methodology

In this section, we will elaborate on the Geometry-Guided Text Prompt Calibration (GGTPC) framework proposed in this paper. First, we formally define the problem and clarify its fundamental motivation. Next, we introduce the core concept of “embedding distribution geometry” and detail its acquisition method under privacy constraints in federated learning. Finally, we describe how clients leverage this geometric prior to perform unbiased local calibration through the Geometric Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL) and inverse frequency sampling strategy designed in this paper, and extend the framework to more challenging multi-domain scenarios.

3.1 Problem Formulation and Motivation

In standard vision-language models (such as CLIP), the objective of prompt learning is to optimize a learnable text prompt vector p_c for category c . The goal is to align the embedding obtained through the text encoder $g_t(\cdot)$ with the global center μ_c^{global} of the visual features generated by the visual encoder $g_v(\cdot)$ for that category. Formally, this objective can be expressed as maximizing the cosine similarity:

$$\max \frac{g_t(p_c) \cdot \mu_c^{\text{global}}}{\|g_t(p_c)\| \|\mu_c^{\text{global}}\|} \quad (1)$$

which $\mu_c^{\text{global}} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,c) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{global}}} [g_v(I_c)]$

However, in the federated learning setting, client k can only access its local dataset D_k and can only compute a biased local visual feature center μ_c^k from it. Due to data heterogeneity, a significant distribution skew exists between the local data distribution $P_k(c)$ and the global distribution $P_{\text{global}}(c)$, leading to:

$$\mu_c^k = \mathbb{E}_{I \sim \mathcal{D}_c^k} [g_v(I)] \neq \mu_c^{\text{global}} \quad (2)$$

This discrepancy between local and global centers forms the core dilemma of federated prompt learning. Optimizing the text prompt p_c solely on local data erroneously guides its embedding $g_t(p_c)$ toward a biased local center μ_c^k , rather than its true target μ_c^{global} . Aggregating these locally biased prompts inevitably yields a suboptimal global prompt. To overcome this fundamental challenge, knowledge about the global data distribution must be introduced to the client to correct the bias from local training. We contend that providing only the global mean (first-order moment) is insufficient. To fully characterize the distribution’s structure, second-order moment information (covariance) is crucial. Therefore, this paper proposes utilizing the “Geometric Shape” derived from the covariance matrix as an ideal, privacy-preserving prior knowledge to guide clients toward unbiased calibration.

3.2 Definition and Acquisition of global Geometric Priors

We emphasize the use of the concept of “Geometric Shapes” rather than merely “covariance” because it provides a more intuitive and profound perspective for understanding data heterogeneity. The distribution of visual features in the embedding space is typically not an isotropic sphere, but rather an anisotropic ellipsoid with distinct directionality in high-dimensional space. These principal axes (feature vectors) reveal variations in intra-class physical properties (e.g., changes in pose or lighting), while their lengths (eigenvalues) quantify this diversity. Therefore, an unbiased text prompt must not only align with the distribution’s center (mean) but also comprehend its structural morphology. The geometric prior in this paper is specifically designed to convey this structural information, guiding the prompt to learn the intrinsic manifold of global features rather than merely their average positions.

3.2.1 Definition of Embedding Distribution Geometry

We formally define the p -dimensional embedding of the geometric shape (GS) of category c in space as the set of eigenvectors and eigenvalues obtained from the eigenvalue decomposition of its global visual feature covariance matrix Σ_c^{global} .

Specifically, for all global visual embeddings $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of a given category c , its global covariance matrix is:

$$\Sigma_c^{\text{global}} = \mathbb{E}[(v - \mu_c^{\text{global}})(v - \mu_c^{\text{global}})^T] \quad (3)$$

By performing an eigenvalue decomposition on this positive definite matrix, we obtain $\Sigma_c^{\text{global}} = U\Lambda U^T$, where $U = [u_1, \dots, u_p]$ is a standard orthogonal matrix composed of eigenvectors, and $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$ is a diagonal matrix composed of the corresponding eigenvalues. Therefore, the geometric shape GS_c of category c is defined as:

$$GS_c = \{(u_j, \lambda_j)\}_{j=1}^p \quad (4)$$

This definition possesses a clear physical interpretation: the eigenvectors $\{u_j\}$ represent the principal axes of the data distribution, indicating the directions of maximum variance; the corresponding eigenvalues $\{\lambda_j\}$ quantify the variance or spread along these axes. Collectively, the geometric shapes GS_c comprehensively describe the orientation, scale, and morphology of the intrinsic ellipsoid underlying the global data distribution.

3.2.2 Privacy-Preserving Acquisition of global Geometry

In the federated learning paradigm, aggregating raw data from all clients to compute Σ_c^{global} is strictly prohibited. Therefore, we designed a distributed method to accurately reconstruct the global covariance matrix from local statistics without compromising data privacy. The global covariance can be decomposed as the sum of intra-client covariance and inter-client covariance. Let n_c^k denote the number of samples for category c on client k , and $N_c = \sum_k n_c^k$ denote the total number of samples. The global mean is defined as $\mu_c^{\text{global}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^K n_c^k \mu_c^k$. The global covariance matrix can then be reconstructed as:

$$\Sigma_c^{\text{global}} = \frac{1}{N_c} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K n_c^k \Sigma_c^k + \sum_{k=1}^K n_c^k (\mu_c^k - \mu_c^{\text{global}})(\mu_c^k - \mu_c^{\text{global}})^T \right) \quad (5)$$

where μ_c^k and Σ_c^k represent the local mean and local covariance matrix for client k , respectively.

To ensure the robustness of the estimation and mitigate noise from data-sparse clients, this paper employs a client selection strategy. For each category c , a subset of clients with the most samples for that category is selected, such that their cumulative sample count reaches 80% of the total. Only these selected clients contribute to the global geometric computation for category c .

The acquisition process follows these steps:

1. **Server Request:** The server requests local statistics for each category from all clients.
2. **Client Computation and Upload:** Each client k computes the triplet $(n_c^k, \mu_c^k, \Sigma_c^k)$ for every category c present in its local data and securely uploads it to the server.
3. **Server-side Reconstruction and Distribution:** The server aggregates statistics from the selected clients according to the selection policy, and computes the global mean μ_c^{global} and global covariance Σ_c^{global} using formula (5). It then performs a singular value decomposition on Σ_c^{global} to extract the geometric prior GS_c and distributes it to all participating clients in the current training round.

3.3 Geometry-Guided Local Calibration

3.3.1 Geometric Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL)

Upon receiving the global geometric prior GS_c , the client can proceed with local calibration. This paper introduces the Geometric Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL), functioning as a feature space data augmentation module. Its core idea involves applying a random perturbation to each local visual embedding, sampled from a zero-mean distribution whose shape is defined by the global geometric prior GS_c . This effectively simulates virtual samples around each local data point that conform to the global distribution’s geometric morphology.

For an arbitrary visual embedding X_c^k of class c from client k , its calibrated version $X_c^{k'}$ is computed as follows:

$$X_c^{k'} = X_c^k + \sum_{m=1}^p \epsilon_m \sqrt{\lambda_m} u_m, \quad \text{where } \epsilon_m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad (6)$$

The perturbation term $d = \sum_{m=1}^p \epsilon_m \sqrt{\lambda_m} u_m$ is a random vector sampled from the multivariate Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_c^{\text{global}})$. This transformation enriches the local embeddings, expanding their distribution to cover the principal regions of the global feature space while preserving their original local information. This process guides the optimization of text prompts away from the biased local centers and toward a target that is more representative of the global distribution, thereby achieving unbiased calibration. The entire process functions as a lightweight pre-processing transformation, seamlessly integrated for end-to-end training.

3.3.2 Mitigating Class Imbalance via Inverse Frequency Sampling

Local class imbalance represents another critical issue, wherein majority classes dominate gradient updates. To address this, we employ an inverse frequency sampling strategy. For a client k , we first identify the maximum sample count n_{\max}^k across all classes. Then, we define a sampling weight $w_c^k = n_{\max}^k / n_c^k$ for each class c , where n_c^k is the number of samples in that class. Finally, the probability of sampling class c is given by:

$$P_c^k = \frac{w_c^k}{\sum_{j=1}^C w_j^k} \quad (7)$$

This strategy assigns a higher selection probability to classes with fewer samples, ensuring a more balanced representation of all classes in training batches and promoting fairer learning.

3.4 Extension to Multi-Domain Scenarios

In the more challenging multi-domain federated setting, where each client’s data originates from a distinct domain, clients face a dual information gap: they lack not only knowledge of the global shape but also positional information regarding data from other domains. Even with a shared geometric shape, clients do not know where to "place" this shape in the embedding space to simulate data from unseen domains. To address this, we extend the GGTPC framework by introducing class prototypes as positional priors.

1. **Distribution of Shape and Position Priors:** The server computes and distributes a shared global geometric prior GS_c (assuming intra-class geometric similarity across domains). Additionally, it computes the mean embedding for each class c in each domain d , referred to as the class prototype μ_c^d . The server then sends the set of all out-of-domain prototypes $\{\mu_c^{d'} | d' \neq d_k\}$ to client k .
2. **Collaborative Calibration:** The local training data pool of client k is augmented with these received prototypes. During training, if a local sample X_c^k is selected, it is calibrated using Equation (6). If an out-of-domain prototype $\mu_c^{d'}$ is sampled, it is similarly transformed via the GPCL mechanism: $\mu_c^{d''} = \mu_c^{d'} + \sum \epsilon_m \sqrt{\lambda_m} u_m$. This generates a virtual feature centered in the foreign domain but exhibiting the global shape.

Table 1: Performance comparison on CIFAR-100 and Tiny-ImageNet datasets under different degrees of label skew (β). The best results are marked in **bold and underline**. FedAvg (CoOp) denotes using CoOp as the backbone with the FedAvg algorithm.

Method	CIFAR-100			Tiny-ImageNet		
	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.1
Zero-shot CLIP		64.87			63.67	
FedVPT	83.53	83.18	80.99	75.91	75.67	74.30
PromptFL	75.05	75.36	72.19	72.66	71.51	67.85
FedTPG	71.40	70.95	68.63	67.63	66.72	64.71
FedPR	81.17	80.44	78.91	72.59	72.22	70.80
FedCLIP	72.03	71.20	70.64	70.41	70.37	69.50
FedAvg (CoOp)	79.28	77.72	75.92	76.84	75.42	73.69
+ GGTPC	84.21	83.75	83.14	80.24	79.93	79.26

3. **Updating Sampling Strategy:** The inverse frequency sampling strategy is adjusted to include these prototypes, treating each prototype as a single sample with a correspondingly high weight, ensuring that both real and virtual data are sampled fairly for training.

By combining positional and geometric priors, clients can effectively simulate a more complete global distribution spanning all domains, thereby enabling the learning of robust text prompts adapted to multi-domain environments.

3.5 Overall Algorithm Flow

The algorithm begins with the initialization of global parameters by the server. In each communication round, the server first collects local statistics (sample counts, means, and covariance matrices) from a selected subset of clients to calculate the global geometry. After aggregating this information to reconstruct the global covariance matrix, the server extracts the geometric prior via eigen decomposition and distributes it to all clients. Upon receiving the geometric prior, clients utilize the proposed Geometric Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL) and the inverse frequency sampling strategy during their local training process to calibrate their data and optimize, resulting in updated local prompts. Finally, the server aggregates the updates uploaded by all clients to generate a new global prompt and proceeds to the next communication round.

4 Experiments

This section presents a comprehensive series of experiments to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed GGTPC framework. Our evaluation is designed around three primary objectives: 1) To validate the performance of GGTPC in diverse and challenging data heterogeneity scenarios, including label skew, domain skew, and mixed skew where both coexist; 2) To demonstrate the capability of GGTPC as a plug-and-play module that can be seamlessly integrated into and consistently enhance various existing Federated Learning algorithms; 3) To provide intuitive visual evidence that, beyond improving accuracy metrics, GGTPC indeed achieves its goal of unbiased calibration of text prompt embeddings.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Label-Skewed Datasets: We evaluate GGTPC on three standard single-domain image classification benchmarks: CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 [61], and Tiny ImageNet-200 [62].

- CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 contain 32×32 images spanning 10 and 100 classes, respectively.
- Tiny ImageNet-200 is a subset of ImageNet containing 200 classes with an image size of 64×64 .

Following recent benchmark settings, we simulate a federated environment comprising 10 clients. To introduce label skew, we partition the data among clients using a Dirichlet distribution $\text{Dir}(\beta)$ [63].

Table 2: Performance evaluation of GGTPC on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Tiny-ImageNet under severe label skew settings (i.e., smaller β values).

Method	CIFAR-10				
	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.01
FedAvg (CoOp)	93.32	92.80	92.21	91.69	90.91
+ GGTPC	96.62	96.57	96.11	95.94	95.66
Method	CIFAR-100				
	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.01
FedAvg (CoOp)	75.87	74.15	72.99	70.86	69.71
+ GGTPC	80.74	79.99	79.63	79.32	78.88
Method	Tiny-ImageNet				
	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.01
FedAvg (CoOp)	73.71	73.23	72.65	71.85	71.31
+ GGTPC	79.28	78.81	78.48	78.15	77.86

Table 3: Performance evaluation on the Digits dataset. AVG denotes the average accuracy, and STD denotes the standard deviation of accuracy.

Method	MNIST	SVHN	SYN	USPS	AVG \uparrow	STD \downarrow
FedAvg	90.40	34.68	46.99	60.30	58.09	20.74
FedAvg (CoOp)	83.05	66.79	86.27	80.62	79.18	7.43
+ GGTPC	91.52	67.90	86.97	90.88	84.32	9.64
SCAFFOLD	97.79	26.64	90.69	94.45	77.39	29.41
SCAFFOLD (CoOp)	83.04	66.27	87.21	79.92	79.11	7.85
+ GGTPC	91.32	67.67	86.97	90.43	84.10	9.62
MOON	92.78	33.36	39.28	68.11	58.36	23.82
MOON (CoOp)	89.69	66.23	86.82	88.24	82.74	9.59
+ GGTPC	95.74	69.20	87.21	94.42	86.64	10.58
FedDyn	88.91	34.57	50.72	60.34	58.65	19.76
FedDyn (CoOp)	83.05	67.07	86.97	80.87	79.49	7.50
+ GGTPC	92.43	67.60	86.92	91.58	84.63	10.05
FedOPT	92.71	31.32	87.92	87.62	74.89	25.38
FedOPT (CoOp)	81.17	66.94	87.31	81.02	79.11	7.47
+ GGTPC	92.53	67.61	86.17	91.53	84.46	10.02
FedProto	90.54	34.61	58.00	89.54	68.18	23.38
FedProto (CoOp)	83.38	66.71	86.67	80.67	79.36	7.60
+ GGTPC	91.66	67.63	86.72	91.28	84.32	9.83
FedNTD	52.31	18.03	97.29	58.07	56.43	28.12
FedNTD (CoOp)	86.42	65.88	85.92	81.46	79.92	8.33
+ GGTPC	93.16	68.43	86.72	90.88	84.80	9.73

The concentration parameter $\beta > 0$ controls the degree of heterogeneity; a smaller β value induces more severe class imbalance on each client, thereby creating a larger discrepancy between local and global distributions.

Domain-Skewed Datasets: We evaluate performance on two multi-domain datasets, Digits and Office-Home, where heterogeneity stems from domain shift.

- **Digits** is a collection of four digit recognition datasets (MNIST [64], SVHN [65], SYN [66], USPS [67]), each representing a unique domain.
- **Office-Home** [68] contains images from four distinct domains: Art, Clipart, Product, and Real World, covering 65 shared object classes.

Table 4: Performance evaluation on the Office-Home dataset. A, C, P, and RW denote Art, Clipart, Product, and Real World domains, respectively.

Method	A	C	P	RW	AVG \uparrow	STD \downarrow
FedAvg (CoOp)	82.65	73.90	91.99	91.48	85.01	7.41
+ GGTPC	89.28	80.84	94.76	93.58	89.61	5.46
SCAFFOLD (CoOp)	82.71	74.59	92.12	92.01	85.36	7.30
+ GGTPC	89.45	81.72	95.11	93.92	90.05	5.25
MOON (CoOp)	83.25	74.63	92.03	91.68	85.40	7.14
+ GGTPC	88.74	80.56	94.73	93.92	89.49	5.64
FedDyn (CoOp)	83.80	76.88	92.42	91.21	86.08	6.25
+ GGTPC	89.55	82.06	95.47	93.81	90.22	5.18
FedOPT (CoOp)	83.01	74.69	92.09	91.88	85.42	7.19
+ GGTPC	88.96	80.84	94.76	93.75	89.57	5.50
FedProto (CoOp)	83.86	77.21	92.06	91.28	86.10	6.05
+ GGTPC	89.77	81.69	95.23	93.90	90.15	5.28
FedNTD (CoOp)	84.46	77.14	92.26	91.68	86.38	6.16
+ GGTPC	89.50	82.26	95.38	94.30	90.36	5.17

Table 5: Performance evaluation on the Office-Caltech-LDS dataset. Am, Ca, D, and W denote Amazon, Caltech, DSLR, and Webcam domains, respectively.

Method	Am	Ca	D	W	AVG \uparrow	STD \downarrow
FedAvg (CoOp)	97.05	95.15	99.24	97.64	97.27	1.46
+ GGTPC	97.59	97.30	100.00	100.00	98.72	1.28
SCAFFOLD (CoOp)	96.78	95.01	97.73	99.06	97.14	1.47
+ GGTPC	97.44	97.56	100.00	100.00	98.75	1.25
MOON (CoOp)	97.45	94.20	98.48	98.58	97.18	1.77
+ GGTPC	97.74	96.92	100.00	100.00	98.67	1.37
FedDyn (CoOp)	97.18	94.74	99.24	98.58	97.44	1.72
+ GGTPC	97.59	97.18	100.00	100.00	98.69	1.32
FedOPT (CoOp)	96.78	95.15	97.73	99.06	97.18	1.42
+ GGTPC	97.74	97.18	100.00	100.00	98.73	1.29
FedProto (CoOp)	96.64	93.94	100.00	98.58	97.29	2.27
+ GGTPC	97.44	97.43	100.00	100.00	98.72	1.28
FedNTD (CoOp)	97.05	95.28	98.48	97.64	97.11	1.17
+ GGTPC	97.74	96.92	100.00	100.00	98.67	1.37

For these experiments, we adopt a strict "one-domain-one-client" assignment scheme, where each client is assigned data exclusively from one domain.

Mixed Label and Domain Skew (LDS) Datasets: To simulate more realistic and challenging scenarios, we construct two datasets exhibiting concurrent label and domain skew: Office-Caltech-LDS [69] and PACS-LDS [70]. For a dataset with K domains and C classes, we first assign K clients to K distinct domains and then generate a $K \times C$ coefficient matrix via a Dirichlet distribution $\text{Dir}(\beta)$ [63] to control the proportion of samples for each class on each client. This construction ensures that each client confronts both domain shift and local class imbalance.

Implementation Details: We employ CoOp as the backbone network for prompt learning, utilizing a pre-trained CLIP model based on the ViT-B/16 architecture. The prompt vector length is set to $L = 16$. The optimizer employed is SGD, with a learning rate of 0.002, weight decay of 1×10^{-5} , momentum of 0.9, and a training batch size of 32. Our method demonstrates high communication efficiency, requiring only $T = 10$ communication rounds for single-domain tasks and $T = 30$ rounds for multi-domain tasks.

Table 6: Performance evaluation on the PACS-LDS dataset. AP, Ct, P, and Sk denote Art Painting, Cartoon, Photo, and Sketch domains, respectively.

Method	AP	Ct	P	Sk	AVG \uparrow	STD \downarrow
FedAvg (CoOp)	98.41	98.84	99.43	90.20	96.72	3.78
+ GGTPC	99.37	99.88	100.00	96.33	98.90	1.50
SCAFFOLD (CoOp)	98.49	99.02	99.76	91.42	97.17	3.35
+ GGTPC	99.44	99.82	99.91	96.80	98.99	1.28
MOON (CoOp)	98.19	98.97	99.68	91.82	97.16	3.13
+ GGTPC	99.51	99.76	100.00	96.91	99.05	1.24
FedDyn (CoOp)	97.36	98.63	99.68	93.04	97.18	2.52
+ GGTPC	99.30	99.82	100.00	96.44	98.89	1.44
FedOPT (CoOp)	98.34	99.06	99.51	89.28	96.55	4.22
+ GGTPC	99.44	99.82	100.00	96.77	99.01	1.31
FedProto (CoOp)	98.11	98.89	99.76	91.32	97.02	3.34
+ GGTPC	99.44	99.82	100.00	96.80	99.02	1.29
FedNTD (CoOp)	97.73	98.93	99.84	89.99	96.62	3.90
+ GGTPC	99.03	99.88	100.00	96.19	98.77	1.54

Evaluation Metrics: We utilize Top-1 Accuracy as the primary metric to evaluate the generalization performance of the final global model. For multi-domain tasks, we also report the Standard Deviation (STD) of accuracy across different domains. A lower STD indicates superior cross-domain fairness and robustness of the model.

Comparison Methods: In single-domain (label skew) experiments, GGTPC is compared against representative federated prompt learning methods: PromptFL[12], FedTPG[13], FedPR[14], and FedCLIP[11] (plus FedVPT). In multi-domain experiments, we apply GGTPC as a plug-in to classic federated algorithms (FedAvg[1], SCAFFOLD[28], MOON[71], FedDyn[72], FedOPT[29], FedProto[73], and FedNTD[74]).

4.2 Results under Label Skew Scenarios

4.2.1 Performance Comparison with State-of-the-Art Methods

To validate the fundamental effectiveness of the proposed GGTPC method, we first compared it with various mainstream Federated Prompt Learning methods on the CIFAR-100 and Tiny-ImageNet datasets. As shown in Table 1, the experimental results demonstrate that the proposed GGTPC method consistently outperforms all comparison methods under varying degrees of label skew (β values ranging from 0.5 to 0.1).

Taking the CIFAR-100 dataset as an example, when the data distribution is relatively balanced ($\beta = 0.5$), GGTPC achieves an accuracy of 84.21%, which represents an improvement over the second-best performing method, FedVPT (83.53%). As the degree of heterogeneity intensifies, the advantage of GGTPC becomes increasingly significant. Under the most challenging setting of $\beta = 0.1$, the performance of the baseline method FedAvg (CoOp) drops to 75.92%, whereas GGTPC maintains an accuracy of 83.14%. This corresponds to a 7.22 percentage point improvement over the baseline and a 2.15 percentage point lead over the second-best method, FedVPT (80.99%). A similar trend is observed on the Tiny-ImageNet dataset; at $\beta = 0.1$, the performance of GGTPC (79.26%) improves by 5.57% compared to the baseline (73.69%). These results compellingly prove that by introducing global geometric priors to calibrate local training, GGTPC effectively combats the distribution shift caused by label skew, thereby enabling the learning of more accurate and robust global prompts.

4.2.2 Robustness Analysis under Extreme Skew Environments

To further investigate the performance boundaries of the GGTPC method, we conducted experiments under a series of more severe label skew environments (β values decreasing from 0.09 to 0.01). The

results, presented in Table 2, reveal a critical phenomenon: as data heterogeneity increases drastically, the performance advantage of GGTPC over baseline methods is further amplified.

On the CIFAR-100 dataset, when β decays from 0.05 to 0.01, the accuracy of the baseline FedAvg (CoOp) plummets from 72.99% to 69.71%, suffering severe performance loss. In sharp contrast, GGTPC exhibits high stability, with accuracy declining only slightly from 79.63% to 78.88%. This implies that under the extreme setting of $\beta = 0.01$, GGTPC achieves a performance gain of up to 9.17 percentage points relative to the baseline. This pattern is also replicated on CIFAR-10 and Tiny-ImageNet.

This phenomenon profoundly validates the core motivation of this paper: when clients' local data views are extremely narrow and partial (i.e., extremely small β values), the calculated local feature centers are far removed from the true global centers. In such instances, the global geometric prior knowledge provided by the server acts as a "God's eye view" calibrator, making its guidance crucial. This fully demonstrates the robust capabilities of the GGTPC method in handling extreme non-IID data distributions.

4.3 Results under Domain Skew Scenarios

To examine the compatibility of GGTPC as a universal module with different Federated Learning algorithms, we conducted a series of "plug-and-play" experiments on two domain-skewed datasets, Digits and Office-Home. In these experiments, GGTPC was integrated into seven classic Federated Learning algorithms, respectively. The results are presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

The results in Table 3 (Digits dataset) and Table 4 (Office-Home dataset) consistently demonstrate that GGTPC yields stable performance gains for all tested Federated Learning algorithms. On the more complex Office-Home dataset, integrating GGTPC into FedAvg, SCAFFOLD, and MOON increased their average accuracy from 85.01%, 85.36%, and 85.40% to 89.61%, 90.05%, and 89.49%, respectively, achieving significant improvements of 4.60, 4.69, and 4.09 percentage points.

More noteworthy is the variation in the Standard Deviation (STD) of accuracy. On the Office-Home dataset, the STD for all baseline methods ranged between 6.0 and 7.5, whereas after integrating GGTPC, the STD generally decreased to the range of 5.1 to 5.7. A lower STD indicates that the model exhibits more balanced performance across different domains, avoiding overfitting to specific "dominant" domains, thereby enhancing the overall fairness and robustness of the model. This result indicates that by providing shared global geometric priors across domains, GGTPC helps individual single-domain clients "perceive" the data distribution morphology of other domains, effectively mitigating the knowledge gap caused by domain shift. These experiments fully demonstrate the powerful versatility and compatibility of GGTPC, establishing it as an effective enhancement module capable of empowering various Federated Learning frameworks.

4.4 Results under Mixed Skew (LDS) Scenarios

To simulate the complex conditions closest to real-world applications, we constructed a Mixed Skew (LDS) scenario exhibiting concurrent label and domain skew, and evaluated GGTPC on the Office-Caltech-LDS and PACS-LDS datasets. The results are shown in Table 5 and Table 6.

Under such rigorous settings, GGTPC demonstrates immense potential for application. Taking the Office-Caltech-LDS dataset (Table 5) as an example, although the baseline FedAvg (CoOp) already achieved a high accuracy of 97.27%, leaving extremely limited room for improvement, the integration of GGTPC still boosted the accuracy to 98.72%, a gain of 1.45 percentage points, while reducing the STD from 1.46 to 1.28. GGTPC delivered similar improvements across all tested algorithms, with average accuracies consistently exceeding 98.6%.

On the more challenging PACS-LDS dataset (Table 6), where baseline performance is more heavily impacted by substantial inter-domain discrepancies (e.g., Photo domain vs Sketch domain), the improvement effect of GGTPC is even more pronounced. For instance, when applied to FedAvg (CoOp), the average accuracy increased from 96.72% to 98.90%, a gain of 2.18 percentage points, while the STD was drastically compressed from 3.78 to 1.50. These results compellingly prove the success of our strategy combining geometric priors and class prototypes. It not only calibrates the distributional shape bias caused by class imbalance but also compensates for the lack of positional




Figure 1: PCA visualization of global visual features and text prompt embeddings before/after GGTPC calibration across multiple classes.

information caused by domain shift, thereby enabling the learning of high-quality global prompts even in the most complex heterogeneous environments.

4.5 Visualization Analysis

To provide qualitative and intuitive evidence for the core argument of this paper—that GGTPC can calibrate local training bias induced by data heterogeneity—this section performs a visualization analysis of text prompt embeddings and visual feature distributions. We employed Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to project the global visual feature embeddings of multiple classes from the test set, their global means, and the text prompt embeddings before and after GGTPC calibration into a shared two-dimensional space. The results are illustrated in Figure 1.

The visualization results clearly reveal the effectiveness of our method. In the subplots for all classes, the blue scatter clouds constitute the true distribution morphology of the global visual features for that class, with their center (Red Point) being the theoretically optimal alignment target for the text prompt embedding. It can be observed that in all subplots, the text embeddings before calibration (Orange Cross) deviate significantly from their corresponding global visual feature centers (Red Point). In Class 0 and Class 3, this deviation is particularly substantial, with the Orange Cross even falling into sparse regions of the feature distribution. This phenomenon intuitively corroborates the core problem raised in our Introduction: in data-heterogeneous environments, baseline models trained solely on local data converge to a biased position and fail to accurately characterize the global data.

In sharp contrast, the calibrated text embeddings (Green Cross) align precisely with the centers of the global visual features across all classes. The Green Cross almost completely overlaps with the Red Point, sitting firmly in the densest region of the feature distribution. This indicates that by receiving global geometric priors and utilizing GPCL for local calibration, clients can effectively overcome the limited view of local data, successfully correcting the optimization direction of text prompts from biased local objectives to unbiased global objectives.

In summary, this visualization analysis provides strong evidence for the internal mechanism of GGTPC from the geometric perspective of feature space distribution, proving that it does not merely achieve improvements in classification accuracy but fundamentally resolves the embedding bias issue caused by data heterogeneity in Federated Prompt Learning.

5 Conclusion

This paper addresses the core challenge of local training bias induced by data heterogeneity in Federated Prompt Learning (FPL) by proposing a novel method named Geometry-Guided Text Prompt Calibration (GGTPC). Transcending the limitations of traditional server-side aggregation optimization or client-side regularization, our approach adopts a fundamentally new perspective, mitigating the distribution shift problem at its source by directly calibrating the client’s local training process. The core mechanism of GGTPC involves aggregating local statistics on the server in a privacy-preserving manner to reconstruct the geometric shape of the global data distribution, which is then distributed to clients as prior knowledge. Subsequently, clients leverage the proposed Geometric Prior Calibration Layer (GPCL) to perform efficient end-to-end feature space calibration, thereby steering the optimization of text prompts toward unbiased global objectives.

Extensive experimental results substantiate the effectiveness and versatility of GGTPC. Across diverse and rigorous data heterogeneity scenarios—including label skew, domain skew, and mixed skew GGTPC not only exhibits superior standalone performance but also functions as a plug-and-play module that consistently bolsters the accuracy and fairness of various mainstream federated learning algorithms. Visualization analysis further provides intuitive geometric evidence that GGTPC successfully realigns biased text prompt embeddings with the true centers of global visual features.

In summary, this work offers a novel paradigm for addressing data heterogeneity in federated learning: shifting the focus from rectifying aggregation outcomes to calibrating the training source. By directly addressing distribution shifts at the feature level, GGTPC paves a new avenue for the development of more robust and efficient Federated Prompt Learning systems. Future research directions include exploring online update mechanisms for dynamic geometric priors to adapt to temporal distribution shifts, as well as extending this calibration philosophy to federated multi-modal learning or generative tasks.

References

- [1] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and trends® in machine learning*, 14(1–2):1–210, 2021.
- [3] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 10(2):1–19, 2019.
- [4] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 37(3):50–60, 2020.
- [5] Qinbin Li, Zeyi Wen, Zhaomin Wu, Sixu Hu, Naibo Wang, Yuan Li, Xu Liu, and Bingsheng He. A survey on federated learning systems: Vision, hype and reality for data privacy and protection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(4):3347–3366, 2021.
- [6] Xuefei Yin, Yanming Zhu, and Jiansun Hu. A comprehensive survey of privacy-preserving federated learning: A taxonomy, review, and future directions. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(6):1–36, 2021.
- [7] Keith Bonawitz, Hubert Eichner, Wolfgang Grieskamp, Dzmitry Huba, Alex Ingerman, Vladimir Ivanov, Chloe Kiddon, Jakub Konečný, Stefano Mazzocchi, Brendan McMahan, et al. Towards federated learning at scale: System design. *Proceedings of machine learning and systems*, 1:374–388, 2019.
- [8] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [9] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022.
- [10] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [11] Wang Lu, Xixu Hu, Jindong Wang, and Xing Xie. Fedclip: Fast generalization and personalization for clip in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13485*, 2023.
- [12] 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*, 23(5):5179–5194, 2023.
- [13] 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.
- [14] Chun-Mei Feng, Bangjun Li, Xinxing Xu, Yong Liu, Huazhu Fu, and Wangmeng Zuo. Learning federated visual prompt in null space for mri reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8064–8073, 2023.
- [15] Chuan Chen, Tianchi Liao, Xiaojun Deng, Zihou Wu, Sheng Huang, and Zibin Zheng. Advances in robust federated learning: A survey with heterogeneity considerations. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 2025.

- [16] Yichen Li, Haozhao Wang, Wenchao Xu, Tianzhe Xiao, Hong Liu, Minzhu Tu, Yuying Wang, Xin Yang, Rui Zhang, Shui Yu, et al. Unleashing the power of continual learning on non-centralized devices: A survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 2025.
- [17] Yichen Li, Qiyu Qin, Gaoyang Zhu, Wenchao Xu, Haozhao Wang, Yuhua Li, Rui Zhang, and Ruixuan Li. A systematic survey on federated sequential recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.05313*, 2025.
- [18] Zhuang Qi, Sijin Zhou, Lei Meng, Han Hu, Han Yu, and Xiangxu Meng. Federated de-confounding and debiasing learning for out-of-distribution generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.04979*, 2025.
- [19] Zhuang Qi, Xin Qi, Tao Xu, Chengrun Dang, Lei Meng, and Han Yu. Federated learning in oncology: bridging artificial intelligence innovation and privacy protection. *Authorea Preprints*, 2025.
- [20] Yue Zhao, Meng Li, Liangzhen Lai, Naveen Suda, Damon Civin, and Vikas Chandra. Federated learning with non-iid data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00582*, 2018.
- [21] 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.
- [22] Qinbin Li, Yiqun Diao, Quan Chen, and Bingsheng He. Federated learning on non-iid data silos: An experimental study. In *2022 IEEE 38th international conference on data engineering (ICDE)*, pages 965–978. IEEE, 2022.
- [23] Mang Ye, Xiuwen Fang, Bo Du, Pong C Yuen, and Dacheng Tao. Heterogeneous federated learning: State-of-the-art and research challenges. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(3):1–44, 2023.
- [24] Wenke Huang, Mang Ye, Zekun Shi, Guancheng Wan, He Li, Bo Du, and Qiang Yang. Federated learning for generalization, robustness, fairness: A survey and benchmark. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [25] Xin-Chun Li and De-Chuan Zhan. Fedrs: Federated learning with restricted softmax for label distribution non-iid data. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 995–1005, 2021.
- [26] Jie Zhang, Zhiqi Li, Bo Li, Jianghe Xu, Shuang Wu, Shouhong Ding, and Chao Wu. Federated learning with label distribution skew via logits calibration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26311–26329. PMLR, 2022.
- [27] Tehrim Yoon, Sumin Shin, Sung Ju Hwang, and Eunho Yang. Fedmix: Approximation of mixup under mean augmented federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00233*, 2021.
- [28] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Satyen Kale, Mehryar Mohri, Sashank J Reddi, Sebastian U Stich, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for on-device federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.06378*, 2(6), 2019.
- [29] Sashank Reddi, Zachary Charles, Manzil Zaheer, Zachary Garrett, Keith Rush, Jakub Konečný, Sanjiv Kumar, and H Brendan McMahan. Adaptive federated optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.00295*, 2020.
- [30] 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.
- [31] Liang Gao, Huazhu Fu, Li Li, Yingwen Chen, Ming Xu, and Cheng-Zhong Xu. Feddc: Federated learning with non-iid data via local drift decoupling and correction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10112–10121, 2022.
- [32] Ming Hu, Yue Cao, Anran Li, Zhiming Li, Chengwei Liu, Tianlin Li, Mingsong Chen, and Yang Liu. Fedmut: Generalized federated learning via stochastic mutation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 38, pages 12528–12537, 2024.

- [33] Ming Hu, Peiheng Zhou, Zhihao Yue, Zhiwei Ling, Yihao Huang, Anran Li, Yang Liu, Xiang Lian, and Mingsong Chen. Fedcross: Towards accurate federated learning via multi-model cross-aggregation. In *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 2137–2150. IEEE, 2024.
- [34] Ming Hu, Zhihao Yue, Xiaofei Xie, Cheng Chen, Yihao Huang, Xian Wei, Xiang Lian, Yang Liu, and Mingsong Chen. Is aggregation the only choice? federated learning via layer-wise model recombination. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1096–1107, 2024.
- [35] Haozhao Wang, Haoran Xu, Yichen Li, Yuan Xu, Ruixuan Li, and Tianwei Zhang. Fedcda: Federated learning with cross-rounds divergence-aware aggregation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [36] Zhuang Qi, Lei Meng, Zitan Chen, Han Hu, Hui Lin, and Xiangxu Meng. Cross-silo prototypical calibration for federated learning with non-iid data. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 3099–3107, 2023.
- [37] Zhuang Qi, Lei Meng, Zhaochuan Li, Han Hu, and Xiangxu Meng. Cross-silo feature space alignment for federated learning on clients with imbalanced data. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 19986–19994, 2025.
- [38] Tianhan Liu, Zhuang Qi, Zitan Chen, Xiangxu Meng, and Lei Meng. Cross-training with prototypical distillation for improving the generalization of federated learning. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pages 648–653. IEEE, 2023.
- [39] Zhuang Qi, Yuqing Wang, Zitan Chen, Ran Wang, Xiangxu Meng, and Lei Meng. Clustering-based curriculum construction for sample-balanced federated learning. In *CAAI international conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 155–166. Springer, 2022.
- [40] Haozhao Wang, Yichen Li, Wenchao Xu, Ruixuan Li, Yufeng Zhan, and Zhigang Zeng. Dafkd: Domain-aware federated knowledge distillation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 20412–20421, 2023.
- [41] Siran Zhao, Tianchi Liao, Lele Fu, Chuan Chen, Jing Bian, and Zibin Zheng. Data-free knowledge distillation via generator-free data generation for non-iid federated learning. *Neural Networks*, 179:106627, 2024.
- [42] Lei Meng, Zhuang Qi, Lei Wu, Xiaoyu Du, Zhaochuan Li, Lizhen Cui, and Xiangxu Meng. Improving global generalization and local personalization for federated learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024.
- [43] Yanbiao Ma, Wei Dai, Wenke Huang, and Jiayi Chen. Geometric knowledge-guided localized global distribution alignment for federated learning. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 20958–20968, 2025.
- [44] Xin Qi, Meixuan Li, Sijin Zhou, Wei Feng, and Zhuang Qi. Federated learning for science: A survey on the path to a trustworthy collaboration ecosystem. 2025.
- [45] Zhuang Qi, Runhui Zhang, Lei Meng, Wei Wu, Yachong Zhang, and Xiangxu Meng. Global intervention and distillation for federated out-of-distribution generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.00850*, 2025.
- [46] Zhuang Qi, Weihao He, Xiangxu Meng, and Lei Meng. Attentive modeling and distillation for out-of-distribution generalization of federated learning. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2024.
- [47] Runhui Zhang, Sijin Zhou, and Zhuang Qi. Federated out-of-distribution generalization: A causal augmentation view. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19882*, 2025.
- [48] Lele Fu, Sheng Huang, Yanyi Lai, Tianchi Liao, Chuanfu Zhang, and Chuan Chen. Beyond federated prototype learning: Learnable semantic anchors with hyperspherical contrast for domain-skewed data. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 16648–16656, 2025.

- [49] Lele Fu, Sheng Huang, Yanyi Lai, Chuanfu Zhang, Hong-Ning Dai, Zibin Zheng, and Chuan Chen. Federated domain-independent prototype learning with alignments of representation and parameter spaces for feature shift. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2025.
- [50] Tianchi Liao, Binghui Xie, Sheng Huang Lele Fu, Bowen Deng, Chuan Chen, and Zibin Zheng. Federated domain generalization with decision insight matrix. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5689–5697, 2025.
- [51] Chengyuan Mai, Tianchi Liao, Chuan Chen, and Zibin Zheng. Fgtl: Federated graph transfer learning for node classification. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 19(1):1–20, 2024.
- [52] 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.
- [53] Yuhang Zang, Wei Li, Kaiyang Zhou, Chen Huang, and Chen Change Loy. Unified vision and language prompt learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07225*, 2022.
- [54] 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*, pages 19113–19122, 2023.
- [55] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkan Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16816–16825, 2022.
- [56] Adrian Bulat and Georgios Tzimiropoulos. Laspt: Text-to-text optimization for language-aware soft prompting of vision & language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 23232–23241, 2023.
- [57] 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.
- [58] Ji Zhang, Shihan Wu, Lianli Gao, Heng Tao Shen, and Jingkuan Song. Dept: Decoupled prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12924–12933, 2024.
- [59] Yaowei Li, Ruijie Quan, Linchao Zhu, and Yi Yang. Efficient multimodal fusion via interactive prompting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2604–2613, 2023.
- [60] 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.
- [61] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *Technical Report*, 2009.
- [62] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [63] Tzu-Ming Harry Hsu, Hang Qi, and Matthew Brown. Measuring the effects of non-identical data distribution for federated visual classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06335*, 2019.
- [64] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [65] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bissacco, Baolin Wu, Andrew Y Ng, et al. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. In *NIPS workshop on deep learning and unsupervised feature learning*, volume 2011, page 4. Granada, 2011.
- [66] Yaroslav Ganin and Victor Lempitsky. Unsupervised domain adaptation by backpropagation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1180–1189. PMLR, 2015.

- [67] Jonathan J. Hull. A database for handwritten text recognition research. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 16(5):550–554, 1994.
- [68] 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.
- [69] Boqing Gong, Yuan Shi, Fei Sha, and Kristen Grauman. Geodesic flow kernel for unsupervised domain adaptation. In *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2066–2073. IEEE, 2012.
- [70] 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.
- [71] Qinbin Li, Bingsheng He, and Dawn Song. Model-contrastive federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10713–10722, 2021.
- [72] Durmus Alp Emre Acar, Yue Zhao, Ramon Matas Navarro, Matthew Mattina, Paul N Whatmough, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Federated learning based on dynamic regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.04263*, 2021.
- [73] Yue Tan, Guodong Long, Lu Liu, Tianyi Zhou, Qinghua Lu, Jing Jiang, and Chengqi Zhang. Fedproto: Federated prototype learning across heterogeneous clients. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 8432–8440, 2022.
- [74] Gihun Lee, Minchan Jeong, Yongjin Shin, Sangmin Bae, and {Se Young} Yun. Preservation of the global knowledge by not-true distillation in federated learning. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35 - 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS 2022*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. Neural information processing systems foundation, 2022. Publisher Copyright: © 2022 Neural information processing systems foundation. All rights reserved.; 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS 2022 ; Conference date: 28-11-2022 Through 09-12-2022.