

Method	Main pros	Main cons	Default privacy preservation approach	Privacy-preserving approaches used or can be used to improve privacy
Federated Learning (FL)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Main computation done in client-side</li> <li>2. Main computation is distributed among all clients</li> <li>3. Raw input data do not leave the data owners devices</li> <li>4. Seamless global knowledge sharing between a few to thousands of distributed devices</li> <li>5. Low-cost machine learning model generation compared to traditional cloud computing approaches</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sometimes resource-constrained client devices may struggle to run a full machine learning model</li> <li>2. Often needs stable communication channels</li> <li>3. Distributed device vulnerabilities can affect the ML model quality</li> <li>4. Malicious servers can try to leak privacy by inferring model parameters shared by the clients</li> <li>5. Malicious clients can also try to leak privacy by inferring the global parameters shared with them.</li> </ol>	Restricting the data to data owners devices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Differential privacy</li> <li>2. Homomorphic encryption</li> <li>3. Secure multi-party computation</li> </ol>
Split Learning (SL)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raw input data do not leave the data owners devices</li> <li>2. Only portion of the entire model is processed in the clients allowing resource-constrained devices (e.g. IoT) to effectively contribute in model generation.</li> <li>3. Higher level of data privacy compared to FL due to the model split.</li> <li>4. Low-cost machine learning model generation compared to traditional cloud computing approaches</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Indecisive model convergence pattern</li> <li>2. Often needs stable communication channels</li> <li>3. Needs to conduct a passive cycle of client model synchronization</li> <li>4. Needs to maintain secured communication channels for client model synchronization</li> <li>5. Distributed device vulnerabilities can affect the ML model quality</li> <li>6. Malicious server can try to use correlation analysis between smashed data and raw inputs to leak privacy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restricting data to data owners</li> <li>2. Splitting the model between clients and the server</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Differential privacy</li> <li>2. Homomorphic encryption</li> <li>3. Secure multi-party computation</li> </ol>
Splitfed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raw input data do not leave the data owners devices</li> <li>2. Only portion of the entire model is processed in the clients allowing resource-constrained devices (e.g. IoT) to effectively contribute in model generation.</li> <li>3. Higher level of data privacy compared to FL due to the model split.</li> <li>4. Low-cost machine learning model generation compared to traditional cloud computing approaches</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Indecisive model convergence pattern</li> <li>2. Often needs stable communication channels</li> <li>3. Distributed device vulnerabilities can affect the ML model quality</li> <li>4. Malicious server can try to use correlation analysis between smashed data and raw inputs to leak privacy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restricting data to data owners</li> <li>2. Splitting the model between clients and the server</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Differential privacy</li> <li>2. Homomorphic encryption</li> <li>3. Secure multi-party computation</li> </ol>