

HybridVFL: Disentangled Feature Learning for Edge-Enabled Vertical Federated Multimodal Classification

Mostafa Anoosha
m.anoosha@hull.ac.uk
School of Digital and Physical
Science
University of Hull
Hull, UK

Zeinab Dehghani
z.dehghani@hull.ac.uk
School of Digital and Physical
Science
University of Hull
Hull, UK

Kuniko Paxton
k.azuma@hull.ac.uk
School of Digital and Physical
Science
University of Hull
Hull, UK

Koorosh Aslansefat
k.aslansefat@hull.ac.uk
School of Digital and Physical
Science
University of Hull
Hull, UK

Dhaval Thakker
d.thakker@hull.ac.uk
School of Digital and Physical
Science
University of Hull
Hull, UK

Abstract

Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) offers a privacy-preserving paradigm for Edge AI scenarios like mobile health diagnostics, where sensitive multimodal data reside on distributed, resource-constrained devices. Yet, standard VFL systems often suffer performance limitations due to simplistic feature fusion. This paper introduces HybridVFL, a novel framework designed to overcome this bottleneck by employing client-side feature disentanglement paired with a server-side cross-modal transformer for context-aware fusion. Through systematic evaluation on the multimodal HAM10000 skin lesion dataset, we demonstrate that HybridVFL significantly outperforms standard federated baselines, validating the criticality of advanced fusion mechanisms in robust, privacy-preserving systems.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Distributed artificial intelligence**; *Machine learning approaches*; • **Security and privacy** → *Privacy-preserving protocols*; • **Applied computing** → *Health informatics*.

Keywords: Vertical Federated Learning, Multimodal Fusion, Privacy Preservation, Disentangled Representations, Cross-Modal Transformer Fusion

ACM Reference Format:

Mostafa Anoosha, Zeinab Dehghani, Kuniko Paxton, Koorosh Aslansefat, and Dhaval Thakker. 2025. HybridVFL: Disentangled Feature Learning for Edge-Enabled Vertical Federated Multimodal Classification. In *2025 IEEE/ACM 18th International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing (UCC '25)*, December 1–4, 2025, Nantes, France. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3773274.3774931>

1 Introduction

Since Google introduced the concept of federated learning (FL)[17], distributed learning has gained traction in fields where centralizing personal data is difficult, such as the healthcare sector operating under stringent data privacy regulations like the European General Data Protection Regulation[23]. While Horizontal FL (HFL) requires uniform feature spaces across clients [31], real-world collaborations often involve diverse organizations holding different features for overlapping user groups [30]. Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) addresses this by enabling collaboration when data sets share the same sample ID space but differ in feature space [31]. Technically, this approach is simultaneously expected to enhance model expressiveness by combining multiple and rich features [4]. Despite the high potential of VFL applications in real-world scenarios, prior research has predominantly focused on HFL, with VFL receiving relatively limited attention [12].

A key aspect of VFL is multimodal processing on the server side. This can be broadly categorized into two types: (1) between homogeneous data, which is the same data structures, such as between images under different protocols [29], and (2) heterogeneous data, such as [16] of images and tabular data. In the latter case, data modality handling itself is complex due to differences in data structure and



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

UCC '25, Nantes, France

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2285-1/2025/12

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3773274.3774931>

label asymmetry; only the tabular side holds labels, which occurs, increasing the learning difficulty. Medical data typically coexists as images and electronic health records (EHR), making this need particularly high [7, 21, 22]. While reports indicate that incorporating EHR in centralized approaches improves classification performance compared to inputting images alone [18], most FL evaluations remain confined to the HFL framework [1, 6, 19, 32], and the effects of heterogeneous feature space collaboration remain insufficiently evaluated. Furthermore, even in studies considering image and tabular pairs within VFL, the feature handling tends to remain simple concatenation [24], and comparative analyses of effects between modal fusion strategies are lacking. Although disentangled cross-modal fusion [29] is a method that splits into modality-invariant and -specific, and then fuses to combine heterogeneous information more effectively and semantically, the prior research has not systematically explored this method for VFL with image and tabular.

To bridge this gap, this study focuses on the medical domain, which is a high-demand field of FVL [20], and systematically compares (1) concatenation, (2) simple cross-attention fusion, and (3) disentangled cross-modal fusion under the VFL environment, analyzing how fusion design differences impact performance. Evaluation utilizes dermatological lesion images and clinical metadata from Human Against Machine with 10000 (HAM10000) [26]. Dermatological lesion classification is a representative task well-suited for mobile health and clinical edge computing [2], making it highly significant for VFL implementation. Our study suggests that semantic fusion is more promising than simple concatenation or simple cross-modal attention, further leveraging the VFL advantage of utilizing heterogeneous features in distributed environments. The three pillars of VFL are robust multimodal fusion design, privacy protection, and fairness. We eventually aim to develop **HybridVFL** that integrates these elements. This paper focuses specifically on examining multimodal fusion design as the first step.

1.1 Main Contribution

Considering existent gaps in federated learning on truly diverse data modalities and simplistic fusion, we assess the effectiveness of disentangled cross-modal fusion and compare it with other approaches for dermatological classification in HybridVFL across heterogeneous image and tabular feature spaces. This distills practical guidance on fusion selection for the HybridVFL dermatological model.

2 Related Work

This work builds on three foundational pillars: *Vertical Federated Learning (VFL)*, *Multimodal Integration*, and *Disentangled Cross-Modal Fusion*. VFL enables collaborative model training across organisations with complementary features,

while Multimodal Fusion integrates diverse modalities into unified, privacy-preserving representations. Disentangled Cross-Modal Fusion further refines this process by separating representations and combining them via attention. Together, these advances lay the foundation for our proposed *HybridVFL* framework for scalable, privacy-aware cross-institutional learning.

2.1 Vertical Federated Learning (VFL)

Federated Learning (FL) is generally categorised into horizontal and vertical paradigms [31]. In *HFL*, clients share the same feature space but hold different sample subsets, while *VFL* supports collaboration among institutions with distinct feature spaces for overlapping entities [11]. Each participant exchanges encrypted intermediate representations, such as embeddings or gradients, securely aggregated by a central server [5, 8].

Modern VFL frameworks have evolved from basic cryptographic logistic regression [8] toward more practical systems like *SecureBoost* [5] for tree-based learning and *Falcon* [28] for interpretable deep learning.

Recent frameworks such as *Falcon* [28] balance scalability and interpretability by combining threshold homomorphic encryption with feature-importance analysis. Overall, VFL has evolved from cryptography-based designs [8, 31] toward more practical and interpretable systems [5], motivating our proposed *HybridVFL* framework for advancing multimodality, scalability, and trustworthy AI in cross-institutional learning.

2.2 Multimodal Integration in Federated Learning

Leveraging complementary data modalities has become central to FL, particularly in VFL, where institutions hold distinct modalities that must be integrated without exposing raw data. Surveys such as Che et al. [4] and Baltrušaitis et al. [3] summarise progress in model architectures and optimisation strategies addressing privacy, heterogeneity, and interpretability. Transformer-based designs, inspired by Vaswani et al. [27] and extended to multimodal contexts by Tsai et al. [25], have proven highly effective for cross-modal representation learning. In the medical domain, such approaches are increasingly applied to federated multimodal diagnosis tasks, with benchmarks like HAM10000 supporting evaluation [26].

2.3 Disentangled Cross-Modal Fusion

Building on multimodal FL, recent works have adopted disentangled representation learning combined with attention-based and Transformer-style architectures [25, 27] to enhance alignment and interpretability in VFL systems. Yan et al. [29] introduced *Fed-CRFD*, which separates invariant and modality-specific embeddings with cross-client consistency, forming the conceptual basis for our disentanglement strategy. These methods broadly aim to isolate shared from

modality-specific information to enable context-aware representation learning [9, 15]. In parallel, contrastive alignment strategies such as *MOON* [13] demonstrate the effectiveness of enforcing feature consistency across federated clients. Together, these advances highlight the potential of disentangled and contrastive fusion to create robust, interpretable multimodal VFL systems.

3 The HybridVFL Architectural Framework

The proposed **HybridVFL** framework mitigates the fusion bottleneck in Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) [14, 31] by combining client-side feature disentanglement [9, 15] with a server-side contextual fusion module based on Transformer attention [10]. The data flow proceeds from raw, siloed client data to disentangled embeddings and a unified global prediction.

3.1 System Overview

HybridVFL operates in a standard VFL configuration [5] with two non-colluding clients and a semi-honest central server. Formally, the shared dataset is defined in Eq. 1:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x_I^{(i)}, x_T^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N, \quad (1)$$

where $x_I^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C}$ are dermoscopic images owned by the *Image Client* C_I , $x_T^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are structured metadata (e.g., age, gender, lesion site) held by the *Tabular Client* C_T , and $y^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}^K$ are one-hot encoded diagnostic labels across $K = 7$ lesion types, maintained only by the server \mathcal{S} . Raw data are never exchanged, ensuring compliance with privacy regulations such as HIPAA and GDPR [23].

3.2 Client-Side Disentangled Encoding

To enable feature-level collaboration without sharing raw data, each client employs a dual-output encoder that decomposes its input into invariant and modality-specific embeddings. The encoder operations are formally expressed in Eq. 2:

$$(z_{\text{inv}}^I, z_{\text{spec}}^I) = E_I(x_I; \theta_I), \quad (z_{\text{inv}}^T, z_{\text{spec}}^T) = E_T(x_T; \theta_T), \quad (2)$$

where E_I (a CNN) and E_T (an MLP) are modality-specific encoders [9, 15, 25]. As shown in Fig. 1, the *Image Client* (C_I) and *Tabular Client* (C_T) process their raw data separately and send only their disentangled embeddings to the server. Here, z_{inv}^\bullet captures shared semantics relevant to malignancy, while z_{spec}^\bullet retains modality-specific information. Only these embeddings are transmitted to the server; raw features remain local.

3.3 Server-Side Disentangled Fusion

As shown in Fig. 2, the server receives the invariant and specific embeddings from both clients and performs two key operations.




Figure 1. Client-side architecture: Specialized encoders (E_I, E_T) disentangle raw data into modality-specific (z_{spec}) and invariant (z_{inv}) embeddings for transmission to the server.

Stage 1: Invariant Alignment. Before fusing representations, the server enforces alignment between invariant embeddings from both clients by minimising the cosine-based consistency loss defined in Eq. 3:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}} = 1 - \frac{\langle z_{\text{inv}}^I, z_{\text{inv}}^T \rangle}{\|z_{\text{inv}}^I\|_2 \|z_{\text{inv}}^T\|_2}. \quad (3)$$

This regulariser promotes a shared latent representation across modalities, improving generalisation [13].

Stage 2: Contextual Fusion. After alignment, all embeddings are concatenated into a single token sequence as shown in Eq. 4:

$$S = [z_{\text{inv}}^I, z_{\text{spec}}^I, z_{\text{inv}}^T, z_{\text{spec}}^T], \quad (4)$$

which is then processed by a Transformer encoder $F_\phi(\cdot)$ that models inter-modality dependencies via multi-head self-attention, defined in Eq. 5:

$$\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V. \quad (5)$$

Finally, the contextualised representations from the Transformer are aggregated through mean pooling as expressed in Eq. 6:

$$z_{\text{fused}} = \text{Pool}(F_\phi(S)), \quad (6)$$

Where the pooling operation follows the convention used in multimodal Transformers [3, 25].




Figure 2. The server receives the four embeddings from the clients. First, a consistency loss (\mathcal{L}_{cons}) is applied to align the invariant features. Next, all four embeddings are combined into an input sequence (S_{input}) and fed into a Cross-Modal Transformer. The transformer applies self-attention to produce a single fused representation (z_{fused}), which is then passed to a classification head to generate the final prediction (\hat{y}).

3.4 Global Training and Optimisation

The fused embedding z_{fused} is passed through a lightweight classifier that outputs the predicted class probabilities via a softmax activation, as shown in Eq. 7:

$$\hat{y} = \text{softmax}(h_{\psi}(z_{fused})), \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ represents the probability distribution over the $K = 7$ lesion classes.

HybridVFL is trained end-to-end by minimising a composite loss combining the categorical cross-entropy objective and the alignment regulariser from Eq. 3. The overall training objective is defined in Eq. 8:

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K y_k^{(i)} \log \hat{y}_k^{(i)} + \lambda_{cons} \mathcal{L}_{cons}. \quad (8)$$

The coefficient λ_{cons} balances the contribution of invariant-space alignment to the main classification objective.

3.5 Communication Efficiency

Unlike centralized training, HybridVFL requires exchanging embeddings between clients and the server at every training round. For our architecture (1600 total embedding dimensions), this incurs approximately 6.4 KB per sample

per round—significantly lower than transmitting raw medical images (120 KB for 100×100 float32 inputs). This low bandwidth requirement makes HybridVFL highly viable for resource-constrained edge environments.

4 Numerical Results

This section presents a comprehensive empirical evaluation of the proposed **HybridVFL** framework. The experiments are designed to systematically validate the effectiveness of the disentangled cross-modal fusion architecture by comparing it against both centralised and federated baselines. The analysis quantifies the performance gains achieved by the proposed approach and contextualises its performance within the inherent trade-offs of the Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) paradigm. The evaluation demonstrates not only the superiority of **HybridVFL** in a privacy-preserving setting but also its ability to achieve performance levels competitive with those of a centralised model.

4.1 Dataset and Preprocessing

All experiments use the HAM10000 (*Human Against Machine with 10000*) dataset [26], a standard benchmark for dermatological lesion classification. It contains 10,015 dermoscopic images with metadata including patient age, gender, and lesion site, providing a realistic multimodal dataset for VFL. The *Image Client* (C_I) holds image data, the *Tabular Client* (C_T) stores the corresponding EHR records, and the server maintains diagnostic labels (y). The task is a multi-class classification across the seven verified skin lesion types, with data vertically partitioned as described in Section 3.

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

Model performance is assessed using standard classification metrics:

- **Macro F1-Score, Precision, & Recall:** Unweighted arithmetic means across all seven classes. These metrics ensure balanced performance evaluation, preventing domination by frequent classes and accurately reflecting detection capability for rare lesions.
- **Test Accuracy:** The overall proportion of correctly classified samples.
- **Balanced Accuracy:** The arithmetic mean of recall across all seven classes. This provides a more reliable performance measure than standard accuracy in the presence of the severe class imbalance typical of HAM10000.

4.3 Comparative Models

The **HybridVFL** framework is compared against several representative models covering distinct architectural paradigms and data-access settings. Together, they define

both a practical federated baseline and a centralised upper-bound oracle.

1. **Centralized Image Only:** A privacy-free baseline using only image data processed by a CNN, establishing unimodal performance and enabling assessment of the added value of tabular metadata.
2. **Centralized Multimodal:** A centralised oracle combining CNN and MLP features through naive concatenation, representing the upper bound achievable with full data access.
3. **Simple Concatenation VFL:** A standard federated baseline where clients send local embeddings to the server, which concatenates them for classification, mirroring early VFL frameworks.
4. **HybridVFL (Proposed):** The proposed framework (Section 3) integrates disentangled client encoders

(E_I, E_T), a cosine-based consistency loss ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$) for invariant alignment, and a Cross-Modal Transformer (F_ϕ) for contextual multimodal fusion.

4.4 Comparative Performance Analysis

The core quantitative results of this study are summarised in Table 1, which provides a direct comparison between the proposed **HybridVFL** framework and the established baseline models. The subsequent analysis examines these results in detail to validate the study’s primary hypotheses and to assess the effectiveness of the disentangled cross-modal fusion strategy under the Vertical Federated Learning (VFL) paradigm.

Table 1. Comparative Performance on the HAM10000 Dataset. The best federated result is highlighted in bold.

Model Architecture	Macro F1	Macro Precision	Macro Recall	Accuracy	
				Test	Balanced
Centralized Image-Only	0.8771 \pm 0.0010	0.8538 \pm 0.0008	0.9074 \pm 0.0018	0.8515 \pm 0.0082	0.9074 \pm 0.0093
Centralized Multimodal	0.9222 \pm 0.0024	0.9130 \pm 0.0027	0.9325 \pm 0.0081	0.9100 \pm 0.0075	0.9325 \pm 0.0081
VFL Baseline	0.7318 \pm 0.0122	0.7123 \pm 0.0131	0.7766 \pm 0.0133	0.6960 \pm 0.0114	0.7766 \pm 0.0132
HybridVFL	0.8928 \pm 0.0113	0.8732 \pm 0.0101	0.9235 \pm 0.0146	0.8880 \pm 0.0127	0.9235 \pm 0.0146

4.5 Superiority of HybridVFL in the Federated Setting

The comparison of centralized models highlights the necessity of multimodal features. The Centralized Multimodal model achieved a balanced accuracy of 0.9325, significantly surpassing the Centralized Image-Only baseline at 0.9074. This gap validates the critical role of tabular metadata in effective skin lesion classification, supporting the core Vertical Federated Learning approach. The results also demonstrate the clear superiority of **HybridVFL** over the standard VFL baseline. In the privacy-preserving configuration, **HybridVFL** achieves a balanced accuracy of 0.9235, an improvement of 14.69 percentage points over the 0.7766 baseline using simple concatenation. This validates the central hypothesis that a semantically aware fusion architecture yields tangible performance gains in VFL. These gains stem from the framework’s core components: client-side feature disentanglement and server-side Transformer-based contextual fusion, which together produce richer multimodal representations from distributed data.

4.6 The Cost of Privacy

The minimal cost of privacy for **HybridVFL** is low, evidenced by only a 0.9-point balanced accuracy gap (0.9235 vs. 0.9325) compared to the Centralized Multimodal model.

This low gap is attributed to the framework’s sophisticated architecture, utilizing client-side feature disentanglement and a server-side Cross-Modal Transformer. Furthermore, HybridVFL significantly outperforms the less robust Centralized Image-Only baseline by 1.61 percentage points (0.9235 vs. 0.9074). This outcome demonstrates the effectiveness of the advanced multimodal fusion in balancing performance with data decentralization and compliance with GDPR and HIPAA.

5 Conclusion and Future Directions

In this work, we introduced HybridVFL, a Vertical Federated Learning framework designed to overcome the limitations of simple fusion in edge-based multimodal applications. By integrating client-side feature disentanglement with a server-side Cross-Modal Transformer, HybridVFL achieves a 14.69% improvement in balanced accuracy over standard concatenation baselines on the HAM10000 dataset. This performance approaches that of centralised oracles while crucially retaining raw data on local clients, demonstrating the viability of sophisticated fusion strategies for privacy-preserving edge intelligence in healthcare.

Future Directions

While effective, this study has limitations that define our future roadmap. First, our current evaluation is limited to a single dataset and two modalities; future work will expand

to diverse clinical benchmarks and incorporate additional modalities such as genomic data. Second, while we analysed communication costs, we will explicitly quantify computational latency and energy consumption on varied edge hardware to ensure real-world feasibility. Finally, although HybridVFL prevents raw data exposure, exchanging embeddings can still be susceptible to inversion attacks [10]. We plan to integrate differential privacy or secure multi-party computation (MPC) to robustly defend against such adversarial threats in production deployments.

Code Availability

The code and experiment results are available for viewing at: <https://github.com/mociatto/HybridVFL>

References

- [1] Bless Lord Y Agbley, Jianping Li, Amin Ul Haq, Edem Kwedzo Bankas, Sultan Ahmad, Isaac Osei Agyemang, Delanyo Kulevome, Waldiodio David Ndiaye, Bernard Cobbinah, and Shoistamo Latipova. 2021. Multimodal melanoma detection with federated learning. In *2021 18th international computer conference on wavelet active media technology and information processing (ICCWAMTIP)*. IEEE, 238–244.
- [2] Nada Alasbali, Jawad Ahmad, Ali Akbar Siddique, Oumaima Saidani, Alanoud Al Mazroa, Asif Raza, Rahmat Ullah, and Muhammad Shahbaz Khan. 2025. Privacy-enhanced skin disease classification: integrating federated learning in an IoT-enabled edge computing. *Frontiers in Computer Science* 7 (2025), 1550677.
- [3] Tadas Baltrušaitis, Chaitanya Ahuja, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2018. Multimodal machine learning: A survey and taxonomy. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 41, 2 (2018), 423–443.
- [4] Liwei Che, Jiaqi Wang, Yao Zhou, and Fenglong Ma. 2023. Multimodal federated learning: A survey. *Sensors* 23, 15 (2023), 6986.
- [5] Kewei Cheng, Tao Fan, Yilun Jin, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, Dimitrios Papadopoulos, and Qiang Yang. 2021. Secureboost: A lossless federated learning framework. *IEEE intelligent systems* 36, 6 (2021), 87–98.
- [6] Qian Dai, Dong Wei, Hong Liu, Jinghan Sun, Liansheng Wang, and Yefeng Zheng. 2024. Federated modality-specific encoders and multimodal anchors for personalized brain tumor segmentation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 1445–1453.
- [7] Hao Guan, Pew-Thian Yap, Andrea Bozoki, and Mingxia Liu. 2024. Federated learning for medical image analysis: A survey. *Pattern recognition* 151 (2024), 110424.
- [8] Stephen Hardy, Wilko Henecka, Hamish Ivey-Law, Richard Nock, Giorgio Patrini, Guillaume Smith, and Brian Thorne. 2017. Private federated learning on vertically partitioned data via entity resolution and additively homomorphic encryption. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10677* (2017).
- [9] Irina Higgins, David Amos, David Pfau, Sebastien Racaniere, Loic Matthey, Danilo Rezende, and Alexander Lerchner. 2018. Towards a definition of disentangled representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.02230* (2018).
- [10] Xiao Jin, Pin-Yu Chen, Chia-Yi Hsu, Chia-Mu Yu, and Tianyi Chen. 2021. Cafe: Catastrophic data leakage in vertical federated learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 994–1006.
- [11] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. 2021. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *Foundations and trends® in machine learning* 14, 1–2 (2021), 1–210.
- [12] Afsana Khan, Marijn ten Thij, and Anna Wilbik. 2025. Vertical federated learning: A structured literature review. *Knowledge and Information Systems* (2025), 1–39.
- [13] Qibin Li, Bingsheng He, and Dawn Song. 2021. Model-contrastive federated learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 10713–10722.
- [14] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2020. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE signal processing magazine* 37, 3 (2020), 50–60.
- [15] Francesco Locatello, Stefan Bauer, Mario Lucic, Gunnar Raetsch, Sylvain Gelly, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Olivier Bachem. 2019. Challenging common assumptions in the unsupervised learning of disentangled representations. In *international conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4114–4124.
- [16] Paul K Mandal. 2024. A distributed privacy preserving model for the detection of Alzheimer’s disease. *Neural Computing and Applications* 36, 36 (2024), 22719–22729.
- [17] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [18] Chubin Ou, Sitong Zhou, Ronghua Yang, Weili Jiang, Haoyang He, Wenjun Gan, Wentao Chen, Xinchu Qin, Wei Luo, Xiaobing Pi, et al. 2022. A deep learning based multimodal fusion model for skin lesion diagnosis using smartphone collected clinical images and metadata. *Frontiers in Surgery* 9 (2022), 1029991.
- [19] Xiaomin Ouyang, Zhiyuan Xie, Heming Fu, Sitong Cheng, Li Pan, Neiweng Ling, Guoliang Xing, Jiayu Zhou, and Jianwei Huang. 2023. Harmony: Heterogeneous multi-modal federated learning through disentangled model training. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services*. 530–543.
- [20] Bjarne Pfitzner, Nico Steckhan, and Bert Arnrich. 2021. Federated learning in a medical context: a systematic literature review. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)* 21, 2 (2021), 1–31.
- [21] Adnan Qayyum, Kashif Ahmad, Muhammad Ahtazaz Ahsan, Ala Al-Fuqaha, and Junaid Qadir. 2022. Collaborative federated learning for healthcare: Multi-modal covid-19 diagnosis at the edge. *IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society* 3 (2022), 172–184.
- [22] Ashish Rauniar, Desta Haileselassie Hagos, Debesh Jha, Jan Erik Håkegård, Ulas Bagci, Danda B Rawat, and Vladimir Vlassov. 2023. Federated learning for medical applications: A taxonomy, current trends, challenges, and future research directions. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 11, 5 (2023), 7374–7398.
- [23] Protection Regulation. 2018. General data protection regulation. *Intouch* 25 (2018), 1–5.
- [24] Agnideven Palanisamy Sundar, Feng Li, Xukai Zou, and Tianchong Gao. 2024. Toward multimodal vertical federated learning: A traffic analysis case study. In *2024 33rd International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*. IEEE, 1–9.
- [25] Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Paul Pu Liang, J Zico Kolter, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. Multimodal transformer for unaligned multimodal language sequences. In *Proceedings of the conference. Association for computational linguistics. Meeting*, Vol. 2019. 6558.
- [26] Philipp Tschandl, Cliff Rosendahl, and Harald Kittler. 2018. The HAM10000 dataset, a large collection of multi-source dermatoscopic images of common pigmented skin lesions. *Scientific data* 5, 1 (2018), 1–9.
- [27] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

- [28] Yuncheng Wu, Naili Xing, Gang Chen, Tien Tuan Anh Dinh, Zhaojing Luo, Beng Chin Ooi, Xiaokui Xiao, and Meihui Zhang. 2023. Falcon: A privacy-preserving and interpretable vertical federated learning system. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 10 (2023), 2471–2484.
- [29] Yunlu Yan, Hong Wang, Yawen Huang, Nanjun He, Lei Zhu, Yong Xu, Yuexiang Li, and Yefeng Zheng. 2024. Cross-modal vertical federated learning for mri reconstruction. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* 28, 11 (2024), 6384–6394.
- [30] Liu Yang, Di Chai, Junxue Zhang, Yilun Jin, Leye Wang, Hao Liu, Han Tian, Qian Xu, and Kai Chen. 2023. A survey on vertical federated learning: From a layered perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01829* (2023).
- [31] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 10, 2 (2019), 1–19.
- [32] Liangqi Yuan, Dong-Jun Han, Su Wang, Devesh Upadhyay, and Christopher G Brinton. 2024. Communication-efficient multimodal federated learning: Joint modality and client selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16685* (2024).