

FLEX-MoE: Federated Mixture-of-Experts with Load-balanced Expert Assignment

Boyang Zhang, Xiaobing Chen, Songyang Zhang, Shuai Zhang, Xiangwei Zhou, Mingxuan Sun

Abstract

Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) models enable scalable neural networks through conditional computation. However, their deployment with federated learning (FL) faces two critical challenges: 1) resource-constrained edge devices cannot store full expert sets, and 2) non-IID data distributions cause severe expert load imbalance that degrades model performance. To this end, we propose **FLEX-MoE**, a novel federated MoE framework that jointly optimizes expert assignment and load balancing under limited client capacity. Specifically, our approach introduces client-expert fitness scores that quantify the expert suitability for local datasets through training feedback, and employs an optimization-based algorithm to maximize client-expert specialization while enforcing balanced expert utilization system-wide. Unlike existing greedy methods that focus solely on personalization while ignoring load imbalance, our FLEX-MoE is capable of addressing the expert utilization skew, which is particularly severe in FL settings with heterogeneous data. Our comprehensive experiments on three different datasets demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed FLEX-MoE, together with its ability to maintain balanced expert utilization across diverse resource-constrained scenarios.

Introduction

Federated Learning (FL) and Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architectures have emerged as powerful paradigms to enable efficient and specialized training of large-scale AI models (LAM). On the one hand, FL provides a decentralized collaborative learning framework, allowing multiple clients to train a global model collectively without sharing raw data, thus ensuring privacy protection and reducing communication overhead (McMahan et al. 2017). On the other hand, MoE architectures (Shazeer et al. 2017; Fedus, Zoph, and Shazeer 2022; Chen et al. 2023) partition large neural networks into specialized experts, which are conditionally activated based on input data, thereby enabling significant scaling of model parameters while maintaining computational efficiency. To leverage the power of both MoE and FL for enabling LAM in edge computing, recent research interests have been attracted to the development of federated MoE.

Unlike conventional centralized MoE, federated MoE faces significant resource constraints arising from edge

clients with limited computational resources, where devices such as smartphones and IoT nodes exhibit highly variable memory, processing power, and bandwidth (Liu et al. 2024; Lee et al. 2024). These computational constraints fundamentally prohibit clients from synchronizing and maintaining all the experts locally, creating a critical scalability bottleneck for the deployment of federated MoE (Mei et al. 2024). For example, a typical MoE model training with 64 experts demands over 80GB of GPU memory, exceeding most edge device capacities. However, existing *full expert storage methods* in distributed MoE implicitly assume abundant client resources, requiring clients to maintain all experts locally (Reisser et al. 2021; Guo et al. 2021; Tran, Pham et al. 2025), which fundamentally limits their practical deployment in resource-constrained environments.

To address the limited computational resources, a straightforward solution is to assign experts randomly based on client capacity. However, such an approach overlooks data heterogeneity and fails to exploit the specialized data patterns that are unique to each client. In particular, data heterogeneity, resulting from non-IID data distributions among clients, poses unique challenges for expert specialization in federated training of MoE (Dun et al. 2023; Yi et al. 2024). Unlike traditional FL with a single dense model, distributed MoE architectures require careful assignment of specialized experts to match the characteristics of local data, as different clients benefit from vastly different combinations of experts for optimal personalization (Luo, Chen, and Wu 2024).

Although some recent work has investigated expert selection in federated MoE settings, most efforts have focused on client personalization without addressing imbalanced expert utilization, which is a key challenge for scalability and generalization. In traditional MoE settings, imbalanced expert utilization is already a known issue that can degrade performance (Shazeer et al. 2017; Fedus, Zoph, and Shazeer 2022; Wang et al. 2024). This problem can be significantly amplified in federated MoE, as data heterogeneity across clients can lead to vastly different expert preferences, potentially exacerbating the inherent expert utilization skew from MoE routing mechanisms. For example, *greedy top-K assignment methods* assign experts based on scoring metrics (Dun et al. 2023; Mei et al. 2024) while ignoring expert load balance among clients. Unlike methods solely emphasizing personalized model performance for individual clients, we aim to

federatedly train a unified MoE model where all experts are sufficiently engaged during training, thereby enhancing the generalization and learning effectiveness.

To address the aforementioned challenges, we propose **Federated MoE with Load-balanced EXpert assignment (FLEX-MoE)**, a novel framework that dynamically assigns experts in a way that is capable of balancing expert utilization and enabling effective specialization under strict resource constraints. Our approach operates through a server-coordinated assignment strategy: the server dynamically collects client resource capacities and computes a newly proposed client-expert fitness score based on training feedback to quantify the suitability between clients and experts. Leveraging these fitness scores, we design an expert assignment algorithm based on linear programming to jointly maximize client-expert specialization quality while ensuring balanced expert utilization across clients. Unlike existing methods that require clients to maintain all experts or use greedy top-K selection without load balance, clients in FLEX-MoE synchronize their own assigned expert subsets based on individual capacity constraints, employ locally trained gating networks, and participate in server-coordinated expert aggregation to maintain both global model coherence and balanced expert training. More specifically, our key contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We address the novel problem of **joint expert assignment and load balancing under resource constraints** in federated MoE, proposing FLEX-MoE, a framework that optimally allocates experts to resource-constrained clients while ensuring balanced expert utilization across the system. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to explicitly address expert load imbalance in federated MoE training.
- We introduce a novel **client-expert fitness score** that quantitatively measures the suitability of experts for each client’s local dataset by incorporating feedback metrics, enabling tailored expert selection that significantly improves personalization and training efficiency.
- We design a **load-balanced expert assignment algorithm** that jointly optimizes client-expert specialization and system-wide load balancing under resource constraints. Unlike existing greedy approaches that focus solely on personalization, our method explicitly enforces balanced expert utilization to prevent expert uneven training and maintain model quality.
- Our FLEX-MoE consistently delivers satisfactory accuracy while achieving the best load balance compared to existing approaches. Notably, our experimental results further show that **enforcing load balance is essential for performance** under severely skewed data, where our method significantly outperforms all other strategies in both accuracy and load balance.

Related Work

MoE and Expert Load Balance. MoE architectures enable efficient scaling of neural networks by employing specialized expert networks with gating mechanisms that route inputs to relevant experts (Shazeer et al. 2017; Fedus, Zoph,

and Shazeer 2022). A critical challenge is to maintain balanced expert utilization, as unbalanced routing can lead to routing collapse and computational bottlenecks (Fedus, Zoph, and Shazeer 2022). Traditional approaches employ auxiliary losses to encourage load balance (Wang et al. 2024), but introduce interference gradients that create trade-offs between load balance and model performance.

Federated Mixture-of-Experts (FedMoE). Recent FedMoE approaches have explored various strategies to integrate FL with MoE architectures. However, existing studies often focus on specific domains or make limited assumptions. For instance, pFedMoAP (Luo, Chen, and Wu 2024) targets vision-language models by enabling clients to acquire pre-processed prompts as experts for CLIP-like architectures. FedMoE-DA (Zhan et al. 2024) explores a different research direction by utilizing peer-to-peer synchronization between clients, however, assuming relaxed privacy requirements that can lead to information leakage. pFedMoE (Yi et al. 2024) considers only two feature extractors as experts per client, employing a fixed, non-scalable model that avoids rather than addresses scalability challenges.

FedMoE with Ample Resources. Most early federated MoE approaches integrate FL and MoE to address client personalization and non-IID data distributions through tailored model training. However, these methods (Reisser et al. 2021; Guo et al. 2021; Zec et al. 2020) implicitly assume ample client resources, fundamentally limiting practical deployment in resource-constrained environments. A³SMoE (Tran, Pham et al. 2025) reduces computational load via sparse activation but still requires clients to store the full set of experts, making it unsuitable for resource-limited devices.

FedMoE with Top-K Expert Selection. The most relevant category of methods performs fixed top-K expert selection by greedy assignment strategies, but completely ignores system-wide expert load balancing. For example, DDOME (Dun et al. 2023) uses fixed top-K expert selection based on data characteristics, while FedMoE (Mei et al. 2024) employs costly two-stage initialization requiring full model deployment. Although these methods achieve personalization, they can lead to popular experts being constantly selected and over-concentrated while others are neglected, undermining the quality of the final aggregated MoE model.

To summarize, prior studies either overlook practical capacity constraints or employ assignment rules that neglect the critical need for dynamic, system-wide load balancing. Our framework is the first to address this gap by jointly optimizing personalized expert selection and enabling balanced expert utilization under explicit resource constraints.

Problem Formulation

In this work, we consider an FL system with a central server and C clients indexed by $c \in \{1, \dots, C\}$. Each client c possesses a local dataset \mathcal{D}_c following non-IID distributions across clients, which cannot be shared with the server and other clients. The goal is to collaboratively train a global MoE model with limited computational resources for each client. For simplicity, we focus on a single MoE layer within a larger architecture, (e.g., replacing a feed-forward block in a ResNet). The MoE layer consists of E experts, denoted by

$\{\mathcal{E}_e\}_{e=1}^E$, each with parameters θ_e . Each client c maintains a personalized gating network G_c with parameters ϕ_c , which is designed to route inputs based on local data distributions.

The key challenges in federated MoE training include:

- **Resource constraints.** Client c can download and update at most $k_c \leq E$ experts in any round due to computational limitations. We denote this round-specific assignment by a set $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)} \subseteq \{1, \dots, E\}$ with $|\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}| = k_c$.
- **Data heterogeneity.** Local datasets \mathcal{D}_c are generally non-IID, requiring personalized expert assignment for effective specialization.
- **Expert load imbalance.** Popular experts may be over-selected while others remain underutilized, leading to degraded model performance.

The learning objective is to jointly optimize the global expert parameters $\{\theta_e\}_{e=1}^E$ and the local gating parameters $\{\phi_c\}_{c=1}^C$ to minimize the global loss function, defined as a weighted sum over all client data, i.e.,

$$\min_{\{\theta_e\}, \{\phi_c\}} \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{|\mathcal{D}_c|}{|\mathcal{D}|} \mathcal{L}_c(\{\theta_e\}_{e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}}, \phi_c), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_c is the average loss on client c 's local data \mathcal{D}_c , $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{c=1}^C \mathcal{D}_c$, and $|\mathcal{D}| = \sum_{c=1}^C |\mathcal{D}_c|$.

The central problem to be addressed in this work is:

Central Assignment Problem

How should the server assign a subset of k_c experts to each client c in each communication round t to jointly optimize:

1. **Resource Constraint Satisfaction:** Expert assignment must respect individual client capacity limitations k_c while maintaining training effectiveness.
2. **Client-Expert Specialization:** Experts assigned to client c should be suitable for its local data \mathcal{D}_c to maximize personalization benefits.
3. **System-Wide Load Balancing:** All experts $\{\mathcal{E}_e\}_{e=1}^E$ should receive balanced training across clients to prevent expert underutilization and maintain model quality.

Method: FLEX-MoE

We propose FLEX-MoE, a novel server-driven framework that addresses the joint optimization problem of expert assignment under resource constraints. Our approach dynamically assigns experts to clients based on client-expert fitness scores while enforcing system-wide load balancing. The framework continuously updates assignment decisions based on client feedback to enable resource-constrained, load-balanced, and specialization-aligned training.

Overall Workflow

We illustrate the FLEX-MoE training loop in Fig. 1. Each communication round t ($t \geq 1$) proceeds through four




Figure 1: System-level workflow of FLEX-MoE: (1) Server assigns experts using optimization-based algorithm; (2) Clients perform local training with assigned experts; (3) Clients upload parameter updates and feedback; (4) Server aggregates updates.

phases, assuming the server has initialized $\{\theta_e^0\}_{e=1}^E$ and collected client capacities $\{k_c\}_{c=1}^C$. Only Steps 1 and 4 run on the server, while Steps 2 and 3 run on the client:

1. **Step 1: Server-side expert assignment.** At the beginning of round t , by using the client feedback (such as model accuracies received from all clients at the end of the previous round $(t-1)$ and the knowledge of the assignment $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t-1)}$ made in that previous round), the server computes a table of client-expert quality scores (detailed in the next section, using data in round $(t-1)$), and employs an optimization-based assignment algorithm to determine the specific subset of expert indices $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)} \subseteq \{1, \dots, E\}$ for each participating client c for the current round t , ensuring $|\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}| = k_c$.
2. **Step 2: Local training.** Upon receiving $\{\theta_e^{(t-1)}\}_{e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}}$ together with the shared extractor $\psi^{(t-1)}$, client c loads them and pairs them with its private gating network G_c parameterized by $\phi_c^{(t-1)}$. The client then performs local training for R local training rounds using its local dataset \mathcal{D}_c . At the end of the local training, the client computes parameter updates $\Delta\psi_c^{(t)}$ and $\Delta\theta_{c,e}^{(t)}$ for every $e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$. For instance, in image classification tasks, the process proceeds as follows:

- **Feature Extraction:** Input x_i is processed by the shared extractor ($\psi^{(t-1)}$), yielding feature map f_i . The feature extractor is learnable and globally shared, which is updated on the server and redistributed to clients at each round.
- **Gating and Routing:** The gating network G_c takes the feature map f_i as input and outputs routing decisions (e.g., scores or probabilities) for the experts in $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$.
- **Final Prediction and Loss:** Expert outputs are aggregated according to the gating weights, forwarded

through the remaining layers, and compared with y_i to compute the loss $l(x_i, y_i; \Theta)$, where Θ includes all trainable parameters such as shared feature extractor parameters ψ , gating network parameters ϕ_e , and client expert parameters $\{\theta_{c,e}^{(t)}\}_{e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}}$.

- **Backpropagation and Parameter Update:** Gradients are computed with respect to the aggregate loss. A standard local optimizer (e.g., Adam with learning rate η_{local}) updates all the parameters.

During local training, the client also records feedback for each assigned expert $e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$ in the current round t , such as the data counts, accuracy, and loss. Specifically, $u_{c,e}^{(t)}$ is the total count of data samples routed through expert e by G_c during the R local training rounds. Let $a_{c,e}^{(t)}$ denote the local model accuracy (e.g., classification accuracy). Let $\ell_{c,e}^{(t)}$ denote the average loss calculated over the subset of images $\mathcal{D}_{c,e}^{(t)}$ routed to expert e in the final local epoch. Specifically, it is calculated as

$$\ell_{c,e}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{c,e}^{(t)}|} \sum_{(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_{c,e}^{(t)}} l(x_i, y_i; \Theta). \quad (2)$$

3. **Step 3: Client-side training upload.** After completing local training for round t , client c uploads the computed parameter updates for the shared feature extractor $\Delta\psi_c^{(t)}$. For the experts, it uploads $\{\Delta\theta_{c,e}^{(t)}\}_{e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}}$, along with the client feedback such as accuracy and loss. The updated local gating parameters $\phi_c^{(t)}$ are retained by the client for the next round and are typically not sent to the server.
4. **Step 4: Server aggregation.** Suppose that S_t is the set of participating clients in round t . In this step, the server aggregates the uploads from all participants in S_t . First, the shared extractor is averaged as in conventional FedAvg, i.e.,

$$\Delta\psi^{(t)} = \sum_{c \in S_t} \frac{|\mathcal{D}_c|}{|\mathcal{D}^{(t)}|} \Delta\psi_c^{(t)}, \quad (3)$$

where $|\mathcal{D}^{(t)}| = \sum_{c \in S_t} |\mathcal{D}_c|$.

Then, for each expert $e \in \{1, \dots, E\}$, it aggregates the received parameter updates $\Delta\theta_{c,e}^{(t)}$ from all clients c that were assigned expert e (i.e., c such that $e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$). Then, a weighted averaging scheme is commonly used, applying usage counts $u_{c,e}^{(t)}$ as weights, which is calculated by

$$\Delta\theta_e^{(t)} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{c: e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}} u_{c,e}^{(t)} \Delta\theta_{c,e}^{(t)}}{\sum_{c: e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}} u_{c,e}^{(t)}} & \text{if } \sum_{c: e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}} u_{c,e}^{(t)} > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

This corresponds to a variant of FedAvg, which weights each expert based on usage. The server then updates the global parameters by $\psi^{(t)} = \psi^{(t-1)} + \Delta\psi^{(t)}$ for the shared extractor, and $\theta_e^{(t)} = \theta_e^{(t-1)} + \Delta\theta_e^{(t)}$ for each expert. At the end of round t , the server retains the client feedback $\{u_{c,e}^{(t)}, a_{c,e}^{(t)}, \ell_{c,e}^{(t)}\}$, which will be used to compute expert assignment for round $(t+1)$ in the next phase.

Algorithm 1: FLEX-MoE Training Loop

Require: Clients \mathcal{C} , experts E , capacities $\{k_e\}$, rounds T_{\max}

- 1: Server initializes $\{\theta_e^{(0)}\}_{e=1}^E$ and shared $\psi^{(0)}$
 - 2: Each client c initializes local gating network G_c with $\phi_c^{(0)}$
 - 3: **for** each round $t = 1$ to T_{\max} **do**
 - 4: **Server-side Expert Assignment**
 - 5: **for** each client c **do**
 - 6: Update fitness scores:
 - 7: $s_{c,e}^{(t-1)} = a_{c,e}^{(t-1)}$ or $\exp(-\alpha_L \ell_{c,e}^{(t-1)})$ as Eq. (5) or (6)
 - 8: $Q_t(c, e) = (1 - \beta) \cdot Q_{t-1}(c, e) + \beta \cdot s_{c,e}^{(t-1)}$ as Eq. (7)
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: Compute target expert load: $\tau^{(t)} = \left(\sum_{c=1}^C |\mathcal{D}_c| \cdot k_c \right) / E$
 - 11: Construct dynamic bounds: $L_{\text{new}}(e), \Gamma_{\text{new}}(e)$ for each expert e
 - 12: **Solve:** $\max \sum_{c,e} Q_{t-1}(c, e) \cdot X_{c,e}$ {Eq. (10)}
 - 13: subject to: $\sum_e X_{c,e} = k_c, L_{\text{new}}(e) \leq \sum_c |\mathcal{D}_c| X_{c,e} \leq \Gamma_{\text{new}}(e)$
 - 14: Obtain optimal assignment: $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)} = \{e \mid X_{c,e} = 1\}$
 - 15: **Client-side Local Training**
 - 16: **for** each client $c \in S_t$ **do**
 - 17: Download assigned experts $\{\theta_e^{(t-1)}\}_{e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}}$ and shared extractor $\psi^{(t-1)}$
 - 18: Train locally for R local rounds on \mathcal{D}_c , compute updates $\Delta\psi_c^{(t)}, \{\Delta\theta_{c,e}^{(t)}\}$
 - 19: Record feedback $\{u_{c,e}^{(t)}, a_{c,e}^{(t)}, \ell_{c,e}^{(t)}\}$ and upload to server
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: **Server-side Aggregation**
 - 22: Aggregate extractor: $\psi^{(t)} \leftarrow \psi^{(t-1)} + \sum_{c \in S_t} \frac{|\mathcal{D}_c|}{|\mathcal{D}^{(t)}|} \Delta\psi_c^{(t)}$
 - 23: Aggregate each expert $\theta_e^{(t)}$ using usage-weighted average from participating clients
 - 24: **end for**
-

Client-expert Quality Score Metrics

We now introduce the aforementioned client-expert quality score for expert assignment.

Client-expert fitness Score (Q) The server maintains a matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times E}$, where $Q(c, e)$ estimates the suitability or “fitness” of expert e for client c ’s local data. A higher score $Q(c, e)$ indicates a better fit (e.g., higher accuracy achieved or lower loss incurred by client c with expert e). After each communication round t , for each client c and each expert $e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$ that it trained, the server updates $Q(c, e)$. This update is based on feedback from client c , such as the average local accuracy $a_{c,e}^{(t)}$ and loss $\ell_{c,e}^{(t)}$ observed for data samples processed by expert e during local training at t .

The fitness indicator $s_{c,e}^{(t)}$ can be designed flexibly. In this work, we adopt two straightforward strategies:

- **Accuracy Driven (Acc-driven):** The indicator is directly proportional to the reported accuracy:

$$s_{c,e}^{(t)} = a_{c,e}^{(t)}. \quad (5)$$

- **Loss Driven (Loss-driven):** The indicator is an exponential function of the negative loss, transforming lower loss values into higher scores:

$$s_{c,e}^{(t)} = \exp(-\alpha_L \ell_{c,e}^{(t)}), \quad (6)$$

where $\ell_{c,e}^{(t)}$ is defined in Eq. (2) and $\alpha_L > 0$ is a hyperparameter that scales the impact of the loss.

The client-expert quality score $Q(c, e)$ is then updated using an Exponential Moving Average (EMA):

$$Q_t(c, e) = (1 - \beta) \cdot Q_{t-1}(c, e) + \beta \cdot s_{c,e}^{(t)}, \quad (7)$$

where $\beta \in (0, 1]$ is the learning rate for the EMA (e.g., $\beta = 0.1$). For $e \notin \mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$, the value is simply carried over: $Q_t(c, e) = Q_{t-1}(c, e)$. The initial scores are set to a constant (e.g., $Q_0(c, e) = 0.2$) for all client-expert pairs.

Expert Utilization Balance Evaluation Metrics

While standard metrics like prediction accuracy measure the overall performance of the trained MoE model, they do not capture how balanced expert utilization is across different experts. To this end, we propose specific metrics as follows.

- **Per-Expert Load Coefficient of Variation (CV):** This metric measures the *relative* imbalance in expert utilization over a recent period. Let $W_e^{(t,w)}$ be the total load (measured as the sum of usage counts) processed by expert e during a sliding window of the last w communication rounds (from round $t - w + 1$ to t). This can be calculated from the client feedback: $W_e^{(t,w)} = \sum_{r=t-w+1}^t \sum_{c:e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(r)}} u_{c,e}^{(r)}$. The CV at round t for window w is calculated by

$$CV^{(t,w)} = \frac{\text{std}_e(W_e^{(t,w)})}{\text{mean}_e(W_e^{(t,w)})}. \quad (8)$$

A lower CV indicates better expert utilization balance, with $CV = 0$ representing perfect balance within the window. If the mean load is zero (e.g., during initial rounds or if no relevant data is processed), we define CV to be zero. We expect algorithms enforcing balanced expert utilization to achieve lower CV values compared to purely quality-driven approaches.

- **Max-Min Load Gap:** This metric quantifies the *absolute* difference between the most and least utilized experts over the recent window w . Using $W_e^{(t,w)}$ as defined above:

$$\text{Gap}^{(t,w)} = \max_e(W_e^{(t,w)}) - \min_e(W_e^{(t,w)}). \quad (9)$$

A smaller gap signifies better expert utilization balance in the worst case.

Load-Balanced Expert Assignment Algorithm

Given the client-expert fitness scores $Q_{(t-1)}$ computed from feedback in the previous round, the server employs our proposed optimization-based algorithm to optimally assign expert subsets $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)}$ for each client c . Unlike simple greedy approaches that select top- k_c experts per client (leading to severe load imbalance), our algorithm formulation jointly optimizes client-expert specialization and system-wide load balancing under resource constraints.

Formulation for Joint Optimization This approach formulates expert assignment as an optimization problem that maximizes total client-expert quality scores while enforcing per-client capacity limits and per-expert load balance constraints.

1. **Optimization Problem:** Let $X_{c,e} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicate whether expert e is assigned to client c in round t . The objective is to maximize the total accumulated quality:

$$\max \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{e=1}^E Q_{t-1}(c, e) \cdot X_{c,e}, \quad (10)$$

subject to:

- **Client Capacity Constraint:**

$$\sum_{e=1}^E X_{c,e} = k_c \quad \forall c \in \{1, \dots, C\}. \quad (11)$$

- **Expert Load Upper Bound:**

$$\sum_{c=1}^C |\mathcal{D}_c| \cdot X_{c,e} \leq \Gamma_{\text{new}}(e) \quad \forall e \in \{1, \dots, E\}. \quad (12)$$

- **Expert Load Lower Bound:**

$$\sum_{c=1}^C |\mathcal{D}_c| \cdot X_{c,e} \geq L_{\text{new}}(e) \quad \forall e \in \{1, \dots, E\}. \quad (13)$$

2. **Dynamic Bounds Construction:** Prior to the assignment, the server computes the target per-expert load $\tau^{(t)} = \left(\sum_{c=1}^C |\mathcal{D}_c| \cdot k_c \right) / E$, reflecting the ideal assignment distribution for round t . For each expert e , the round-wise load deviation is defined as

$$d_e^{(t-1)} = W_e^{(t-1)} - \tau^{(t-1)}, \quad (14)$$

where $W_e^{(t-1)} = \sum_{c:e \in \mathcal{A}_c^{(t-1)}} |\mathcal{D}_c|$ is the actual load assigned to expert e in the previous round. The historical deficit $D_e^{(t)}$ is updated using exponential smoothing by

$$D_e^{(t)} = (1 - \gamma) D_e^{(t-1)} + \gamma d_e^{(t-1)}. \quad (15)$$

The target load for round t is adjusted accordingly as

$$\text{TargetLoad}_e^{(t)} = \tau^{(t)} - \alpha_{\text{adj}} \cdot D_e^{(t)}. \quad (16)$$

The dynamic load bounds are then defined as

$$\delta_{\text{dev}} = \delta_{\text{ratio}} \cdot \tau^{(t)}, \quad (17)$$

$$L_{\text{new}}^{(t)}(e) = \max \left(0, \text{TargetLoad}_e^{(t)} - \delta_{\text{dev}} \right), \quad (18)$$

$$\Gamma_{\text{new}}^{(t)}(e) = \text{TargetLoad}_e^{(t)} + \delta_{\text{dev}}, \quad (19)$$

where γ , α_{adj} , and δ_{ratio} are hyper-parameter.

3. **Solution Method:** The optimization problem is adapted from prior work on the Generalized Assignment Problem (GAP) (Ross and Soland 1975; Nauss 2003) with additional dynamic load-balancing constraints. It is solved by the server utilizing standard solvers accessed through the PuLP library. The optimal binary assignment matrix $\{X_{c,e}\}$ determines each client's selected expert subset: $\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)} = \{e \mid X_{c,e} = 1\}$.

In summary, solving Eq. (10) produces an expert assignment that optimizes fitness scores, adheres to client capacity constraints, and maintains bounded load imbalance across clients.

Experiments

In this section, we empirically evaluate the performance of our proposed FLEX-MoE framework. We aim to demonstrate its effectiveness in training MoE models in resource-constrained federated settings, focusing on model accuracy and expert load balancing.

Experimental Setup

We conduct experiments on three benchmark datasets: CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky, Hinton et al. 2009), EMNIST (Deng 2012), and GTSRB (Stallkamp et al. 2011), simulating both IID and non-IID data distributions across clients. To simulate data heterogeneity, we employ two standard non-IID data distributions commonly used in FL (Lu et al. 2024): Dirichlet distribution (controlling label concentration across clients) and Class partition (limiting each client to a fixed number of classes). Our model architecture incorporates an MoE layer with a ResNet model as each expert. The MoE layer consists of E experts, and each client c can load at most k_c experts. We train for $T_{\max} = 100$ communication rounds with $R = 3$ local training rounds per client. For the main experiments, the client-expert quality score Q is calculated by using Eqs. (5)-(6). Key evaluation metrics include average test accuracy across clients and expert utilization balance evaluated by the CV (Eq. (8)) and Max-Min (Eq. (9)) with window $W = T_{\max}$ covering the entire training period.

Preliminary Study: Limited Expert Access

To motivate our approach, we evaluate how expert capacity affects MoE performance in FL. We compare three settings: 1) a dense model with a single shared expert, 2) a full-capacity MoE where each client loads all 8 experts, and 3) a resource-constrained MoE where each client has heterogeneous capacity $k_c \in [2, 6]$ and *randomly* receives experts according to this capacity.

Setting	Clients (C)	Experts (E)	Cap. (k_c)	Acc.(%)
(1)	20	1	1	63.71
(2)	20	8	8	76.82
(3)	20	8	[2,6]	72.03

Table 1: Acc. under different expert access configurations.

As shown in Table 1, expert specialization improves accuracy (77% vs. 64%), but limited access to experts degrades performance (72%), highlighting the need for effective, capacity-aware expert assignment in FL.

Baselines

We compare our method against two baselines: *Random* assignment and *Greedy* selection.

Random Assignment (*Random*). Each client is randomly assigned k_c experts, ensuring nearly equal expert utilization but ignoring client-expert compatibility.

Greedy Top- k_c Selection (*Greedy*). This baseline follows the greedy top- k selection strategy similar to existing federated MoE approaches (Dun et al. 2023; Mei et al. 2024),

while using our fitness metrics in expert evaluation for fair comparison. Given the quality matrix $Q_{t-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times E}$, each client c independently selects the top k_c experts with the highest fitness scores following

$$\mathcal{A}_c^{(t)} = \text{TopK}_{k_c}(\mathbf{q}_c), \quad (20)$$

where \mathbf{q}_c is client c 's quality row from Q_{t-1} . This approach prioritizes client-expert personalization while ignoring global expert load balancing.

Comparison of General Results

We evaluate all three methods under both IID and non-IID data distributions, with two expert scoring indicators (Acc- and Loss-driven) across three datasets (Table 2). Clients operate under limited capacity, accessing a subset of experts.

FLEX-MoE achieves the best accuracy in most cases. Our proposed FLEX-MoE method achieves the highest accuracy in the majority of configurations, though Greedy occasionally outperforms it in certain scenarios (e.g., GTSRB IID with Loss-driven indicator). FLEX-MoE demonstrates consistently superior performance through its joint optimization of expert-client matching and load balancing.

FLEX-MoE provides consistently superior expert load balancing. Across all configurations, FLEX-MoE achieves the lowest CV in expert usage, indicating nearly uniform expert training and superior expert utilization balance compared to all baselines. In contrast, Greedy often causes significant imbalance (e.g., CV exceeding 0.2 in some cases) as it prioritizes high-quality experts without considering global load distribution, leading to amplified expert usage skew.

Computational overhead remains practical. While the Greedy baseline adds virtually no runtime cost compared to Random, our proposed FLEX-MoE incurs a modest 6% training time increase (24.3 vs. 25.8 minutes on dual NVIDIA A100 GPUs for CIFAR-10 IID) for significantly improved load balancing, making it practical for federated training.

When Is Load Balancing Most Helpful?

We now examine when load-balanced expert assignment is most beneficial, focusing on scenarios with strong data skew. Building on our earlier setup ($C = 20$, $E = 8$, $k_c \in [2, 6]$), we evaluate two more challenging non-IID conditions: (1) 2-Class partition and (2) Dirichlet $\alpha = 0.1$ to simulate severe label imbalance across clients.

FLEX-MoE consistently outperforms Greedy under highly skewed data distributions. Across all datasets and expert scoring indicators, FLEX-MoE achieves significantly higher accuracy and consistently superior expert load balancing than Greedy and Random (Tables 3 and 4).

FLEX-MoE demonstrates superior performance with stronger benefits under data heterogeneity. Our proposed FLEX-MoE method shows two key performance patterns: 1) In general federated settings, FLEX-MoE achieves better accuracy than Greedy in more than half of the test cases while maintaining consistently superior load balancing across all configurations. 2) In severely skewed data distributions (2-Class partition, Dirichlet $\alpha = 0.1$), FLEX-MoE consistently

Indicator	Algo.	CIFAR10			EMNIST			GTSRB		
		Acc.(%)	CV	Max-Min	Acc.(%)	CV	Max-Min	Acc.(%)	CV	Max-Min
IID										
–	Random	72.03	0.0270	194000	97.48	0.0285	63360	57.34	0.0319	74550
Acc-driven	Greedy	78.44	0.3100	1658000	97.21	0.2785	451200	92.79	0.1366	292875
	FLEX-MoE	79.48	0.0028	12000	98.33	0.0040	5760	98.00	0.0047	6390
Loss-driven	Greedy	78.71	0.2980	1794000	98.02	0.1671	340800	90.88	0.0960	175725
	FLEX-MoE	83.00	0.0028	12000	98.08	0.0040	5760	76.48	0.0045	6390
Non-IID (Dirichlet $\alpha = 0.8$)										
–	Random	56.70	0.0283	202365	83.26	0.0305	190274	47.31	0.0433	27746
Acc-driven	Greedy	62.26	0.2092	1178539	86.18	0.2191	1036969	68.03	0.1786	100093
	FLEX-MoE	64.52	0.0030	14564	83.88	0.0038	14688	59.34	0.0164	6120
Loss-driven	Greedy	61.14	0.2951	1794908	85.06	0.2093	992532	67.94	0.0153	9210
	FLEX-MoE	68.81	0.0030	14085	86.91	0.0041	18482	76.50	0.0085	5410
Non-IID (4-Class partition)										
–	Random	18.70	0.0261	180000	76.50	0.0322	1813456	17.91	0.0497	42026
Acc-driven	Greedy	46.25	0.1602	1028000	86.81	0.2164	9088941	57.01	0.0989	65003
	FLEX-MoE	58.61	0.0028	12000	82.57	0.0046	184706	44.42	0.0236	6353
Loss-driven	Greedy	55.51	0.2270	1388000	86.88	0.1180	5250878	48.94	0.0255	10187
	FLEX-MoE	65.51	0.0028	12000	80.53	0.0053	173239	50.30	0.0081	3603

Table 2: Performance comparison across three datasets (Client count $C = 20$, Expert count $E = 8$, $k_c \in [2, 6]$).

Indicator	Algo.	Acc.(%)	CV	Max-Min
–	Random	7.19	0.0261	180000
Acc-driven	Greedy	51.28	0.1918	1346000
	FLEX-MoE	61.00	0.0028	12000
Loss-driven	Greedy	32.53	0.2446	1426000
	FLEX-MoE	59.44	0.0028	12000

Table 3: Performance comparison under non-IID data (2-Class partition, $C = 20$, $E = 8$, $k_c \in [2, 6]$).

Indicator	Algo.	Acc.(%)	CV	Max-Min
–	Random	23.42	0.0334	226800
Acc-driven	Greedy	52.28	0.1855	1111136
	FLEX-MoE	67.60	0.0024	13188
Loss-driven	Greedy	46.17	0.1417	966123
	FLEX-MoE	55.75	0.0030	13972

Table 4: Performance comparison under non-IID data (Dirichlet $\alpha = 0.1$, $C = 20$, $E = 8$, $k_c \in [2, 6]$).

outperforms Greedy in both accuracy and load balancing metrics across all scenarios.

Expert over-concentration under Greedy assignment reduces specialization and hurts accuracy. Analysis of expert-client assignment patterns reveals that Greedy causes certain experts to be overused by many clients, while others are rarely selected. This mixing of diverse client gradi-

ents reduces expert specialization and hurts generalization. In contrast, FLEX-MoE spreads expert assignment more evenly, enabling more stable expert updates and better specialization. These results demonstrate that load balancing becomes increasingly critical as data heterogeneity intensifies.

Conclusion

We proposed FLEX-MoE, a federated MoE framework that addresses the critical challenge of expert assignment under resource constraints while ensuring system-wide load balancing. Our framework introduces a client-expert fitness score mechanism and a load-balanced expert assignment algorithm that jointly optimizes client-expert specialization and balanced expert utilization. Experimental results on three datasets demonstrate that load balancing is essential for effective federated MoE training, particularly under non-IID data distributions where a naive greedy baseline leads to severe expert imbalance and degraded performance. Our approach consistently achieves superior load balance while maintaining competitive accuracy, highlighting the importance of global optimization in federated MoE deployment.

References

- Chen, T.; Zhang, Z.; Jaiswal, A.; Liu, S.; and Wang, Z. 2023. Sparse moe as the new dropout: Scaling dense and self-slimmable transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.01610*.
- Deng, L. 2012. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research [best of the web]. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 29(6): 141–142.
- Dun, C.; Garcia, M. H.; Zheng, G.; Awadallah, A. H.; Sim, R.; Kyrillidis, A.; and Dimitriadis, D. 2023. Fedjets: Efficient just-in-time personalization with federated mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08586*.
- Fedus, W.; Zoph, B.; and Shazeer, N. 2022. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(120): 1–39.
- Guo, B.; Mei, Y.; Xiao, D.; and Wu, W. 2021. PFL-MoE: Personalized federated learning based on mixture of experts. In *Asia-Pacific Web (APWeb) and Web-Age Information Management (WAIM) Joint International Conference on Web and Big Data*, 480–486. Springer.
- Krizhevsky, A.; Hinton, G.; et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.
- Lee, R.; Fernandez-Marques, J.; Hu, S. X.; Li, D.; Laskaridis, S.; Hospedales, T.; Huszár, F.; Lane, N. D.; et al. 2024. Recurrent early exits for federated learning with heterogeneous clients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14791*.
- Liu, X.; Xu, L.; Wu, X.; Zhang, S.; and Wang, L. 2024. Split-FL: An Efficient Online Federated Learning Framework with Constrained Computation and Streaming Data. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. Workshops*, 661–666. Denver, CO, USA.
- Lu, Z.; Pan, H.; Dai, Y.; Si, X.; and Zhang, Y. 2024. Federated learning with non-iid data: A survey. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 11(11): 19188–19209.
- Luo, J.; Chen, C.; and Wu, S. 2024. Mixture of Experts Made Personalized: Federated Prompt Learning for Vision-Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10114*.
- McMahan, B.; Moore, E.; Ramage, D.; Hampson, S.; and y Arcas, B. A. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 1273–1282. PMLR.
- Mei, H.; Cai, D.; Zhou, A.; Wang, S.; and Xu, M. 2024. Fed-MoE: Personalized Federated Learning via Heterogeneous Mixture of Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11304*.
- Nauss, R. M. 2003. Solving the generalized assignment problem: An optimizing and heuristic approach. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 15(3): 249–266.
- Reisser, M.; Louizos, C.; Gavves, E.; and Welling, M. 2021. Federated mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06724*.
- Ross, G. T.; and Soland, R. M. 1975. A branch and bound algorithm for the generalized assignment problem. *Mathematical programming*, 8(1): 91–103.
- Shazeer, N.; Mirhoseini, A.; Maziarz, K.; Davis, A.; Le, Q.; Hinton, G.; and Dean, J. 2017. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Stallkamp, J.; Schlipsing, M.; Salmen, J.; and Igel, C. 2011. The German traffic sign recognition benchmark: a multi-class classification competition. In *The 2011 international joint conference on neural networks*, 1453–1460. IEEE.
- Tran, V.-T.; Pham, Q.-V.; et al. 2025. Revisiting Sparse Mixture of Experts for Resource-adaptive Federated Fine-tuning Foundation Models. In *ICLR 2025 Workshop on Modularity for Collaborative, Decentralized, and Continual Deep Learning*.
- Wang, L.; Gao, H.; Zhao, C.; Sun, X.; and Dai, D. 2024. Auxiliary-loss-free load balancing strategy for mixture-of-experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15664*.
- Yi, L.; Yu, H.; Ren, C.; Zhang, H.; Wang, G.; Liu, X.; and Li, X. 2024. pFedMoE: Data-level personalization with mixture of experts for model-heterogeneous personalized federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01350*.
- Zec, E. L.; Mogren, O.; Martinsson, J.; Sütfield, L. R.; and Gillblad, D. 2020. Specialized federated learning using a mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02056*.
- Zhan, Z.; Zhao, W.; Li, Y.; Liu, W.; Zhang, X.; Tan, C. W.; Wu, C.; Guo, D.; and Chen, X. 2024. FedMoE-DA: Federated Mixture of Experts via Domain Aware Fine-grained Aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02115*.