

More is Better (Mostly): On the Backdoor Attacks in Federated Graph Neural Networks

Jing Xu

Delft University of Technology

Kaitai Liang

Delft University of Technology

Rui Wang

Delft University of Technology

Stjepan Picek

Radboud University

Abstract

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are a class of deep learning-based methods for processing graph domain information. GNNs have recently become a widely used graph analysis method due to their superior ability to learn representations for complex graph data. However, due to privacy concerns and regulation restrictions, centralized GNNs can be difficult to apply to data-sensitive scenarios. Federated learning (FL) is an emerging technology developed for privacy-preserving settings when several parties need to train a shared global model collaboratively. Although many research works have applied FL to train GNNs (Federated GNNs), there is no research on their robustness to backdoor attacks.

This paper bridges this gap by conducting two types of backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs: centralized backdoor attacks (CBA) and distributed backdoor attacks (DBA). CBA is conducted by embedding the same global trigger during training for every malicious party, while DBA is conducted by decomposing a global trigger into separate local triggers and embedding them into the training dataset of different malicious parties, respectively. Our experiments show that the DBA attack success rate is higher than CBA in almost all evaluated cases, while rarely, the DBA attack performance is close to CBA. For CBA, the attack success rate of all local triggers is similar to the global trigger even if the training set of the adversarial party is embedded with the global trigger. To further explore the properties of two backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs, we evaluate the attack performance for different trigger sizes, poisoning intensities, and trigger densities, with trigger density being the most influential.

1 Introduction

Graph Neural Networks, which generalize traditional deep neural networks (DNNs) to graph data, pave a

new way to effectively learn representations for complex graph-structured data [39]. Due to their strong representation learning capability, GNNs have demonstrated remarkable performance in various domains, e.g., drug discovery [42, 24], finance [37, 7], social network [11, 14], and recommendation systems [45, 10]. Usually, GNNs are trained through centralized training. However, because of privacy concerns, regulatory restrictions, and commercial competition, GNNs can also face challenges when centrally trained. For example, the financial institution may utilize GNN as a fraud detection model, but they can only have transaction data of its registered users (no data of other users because of privacy concerns). Thus, the model is not effective for other users. Similarly, in a drug discovery industry that applies GNNs, pharmaceutical research institutions can dramatically benefit from other institutions' data, but they cannot disclose their private data for commercial reasons [17].

Federated Learning is a distributed learning paradigm that works on isolated data. In FL, clients can collaboratively train a shared global model under the orchestration of a central server while keeping the data decentralized [20, 28]. Therefore, FL is a promising solution for training GNNs over isolated graph data, and there are already some works utilizing FL to train GNNs [17, 47, 22], which we denote as *Federated GNNs*.

Although FL has been successfully applied in domains like computer vision [26, 25] and language processing [51, 16], there may be malicious clients among millions of clients, leading to various adversarial attacks [1, 12]. In particular, limited access to local clients' data due to privacy concerns or regulatory constraints may facilitate backdoor attacks on the global model trained in FL. A backdoor attack is a type of poisoning attack aiming to manipulate part of the training dataset with a specific pattern such that the model trained on the manipulated dataset will misclassify the testing dataset with the same trigger pattern [27]. For example, a backdoored image classification model misclassifies images

with specific features to an attacker-chosen class, and a backdoored word-prediction model predicts attacker-chosen words for certain sentences.

Backdoor attacks on FL have been recently studied [1, 2, 41]. However, these attacks are applied in federated learning on the Euclidean data, e.g., images and words. Additionally, intensive research has been conducted on backdoor attacks in GNNs [49, 40, 43]. These works all focus on GNN models in centralized training. There is so far no work exploring backdoor attacks in federated learning on graph data. With the increasing application of FL in GNNs, it is critical to explore how backdoor attacks behave in Federated GNNs, and, more importantly, how can we exploit the FL’s distributed learning methodology to implement backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs.

This paper conducts two backdoor attacks in FL: centralized backdoor attacks [41] and distributed backdoor attacks [41]. In the first attack, the attacker embeds the same global trigger to all adversarial clients, while in the second one, the adversary decomposes the global trigger into several local triggers and embeds them to different malicious clients, respectively. In the distributed backdoor attack, we assume two attack scenarios - honest majority attack scenario and malicious majority attack scenario to explore the impact of the percentage of malicious clients on the attack performance. Furthermore, since it is an NP-hard problem for graph data to decompose a graph into subgraphs [8], we first generate local triggers and then compose them to get the global trigger used in CBA.

Through extensive experiments on several real-world datasets, our main contributions and findings can be summarized as follows:

- We explore two kinds of backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs. Based on the experiments, we find that the distributed backdoor attack on Federated GNNs is more effective or (at least) similar to the centralized backdoor attack. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first work studying backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs.
- We find that in the centralized backdoor attack, although the adversarial local model is commonly implanted with the global trigger, the final global model can also attain promising attack performance with any local trigger. Since this phenomenon is not consistent with the related works, we provide further experiments to explain it.
- We perform comprehensive analysis and ablation studies on several trigger factors in two kinds of backdoor attacks, including the trigger size, poisoning intensity, and trigger density. We find trigger density is the most influential one, and these factors have little impact on the clean testing accuracy.

2 Background

2.1 Federated Learning

Federated Learning enables n clients to train a global model \mathbf{w} collaboratively without revealing local datasets. Unlike centralized learning, where local datasets have to be collected by a central server before training, FL performs training by uploading the weights of local models ($\{\mathbf{w}^i \mid i \in n\}$) to a parametric server. Specifically, FL aims to optimize a loss function:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \ell(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{k_i}{n} L_i(\mathbf{w}), L_i(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{k_i} \sum_{j \in P_i} \ell_j(\mathbf{w}, x_j), \quad (1)$$

where $L_i(\mathbf{w})$ and k_i are the loss function and local data size of i -th client, respectively. P_i refers to the set of data indices with size k_i .

At t -th iteration, the training of FL can be divided into three steps:

- *Global model download.* All clients download the global model \mathbf{w}_t from the server.
- *Local training.* Each client updates the global model by training with their datasets: $\mathbf{w}_t^i \leftarrow \mathbf{w}_t^i - \eta \frac{\partial L(\mathbf{w}_t, b)}{\partial \mathbf{w}_t^i}$, where η and b refer to learning rate and local batch, respectively.
- *Aggregation.* After the clients upload their local models $\{\mathbf{w}_t^i \mid i \in n\}$, the server updates the global model by aggregating the local models: $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{w}_t^i$.

2.2 Graph Neural Networks

Recently, Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have achieved significant success in processing non-Euclidean spatial data, which are very common in many real-world scenarios. Unlike traditional neural networks, e.g., convolutional neural network (CNN) and recurrent neural network (RNN), GNNs can work on graph data. GNNs take a graph $G = (V, E, X)$ as an input, where V, E, X denote nodes, edges, and node attributes, and learn a representation vector (embedding) for each node $v \in G$, z_v , or the entire graph, z_G .

Modern GNNs follow a neighborhood aggregation strategy, where one iteratively updates the representation of a node by aggregating representations of its neighbors. After k iterations of aggregation, a node’s representation captures both structure and feature information within its k -hop network neighborhood. Formally, the k -th layer of a GNN is (e.g., GCN [21], GraphSAGE [15], and GAT [36]):

$$z_v^{(k)} = \sigma(z_v^{(k-1)}, AGG(\{z_u^{(k-1)}; u \in \mathcal{N}_v\})), \forall k \in [K] \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: Overview of backdoor attacks on FL.

where $z_v^{(k)}$ is the representation of node v computed in the k -th iteration. \mathcal{N} are neighbors of node v , and the $AGG(\cdot)$ is an aggregation function that can vary for different GNN models. $z_v^{(0)}$ is initialized as node feature, while σ is an activation function.

For the node classification task, the node representation z_v is used for prediction. For the graph classification task, the READOUT function pools the node representations for a graph-level representation z_G :

$$z_G = READOUT(z_v; v \in V). \quad (3)$$

READOUT can be a simple permutation invariant function such as summation or a more sophisticated graph-level pooling function [46, 48]. In this paper, we focus on GNNs for the graph classification task.

2.3 Backdoor Attacks on Federated Learning

Backdoor attacks aim to make a model misclassify a preset-specific label while other classification results behave normally. Attackers poison the model by injecting triggers into the training dataset, and they can activate these triggers in the testing phase. Once activated, the model’s output becomes the targeted label pre-specified by the attacker to achieve the malicious intent purpose (such as misclassification).

Backdoor attacks are common in FL systems with multiple training dataset owners. Specifically, the adversary \mathcal{A} manipulates one or more local models to obtain poisoned models \tilde{W}^i that are then aggregated into the global model G_t and thus affect its properties. Figure 1 shows two common techniques used in backdoor attacks in FL: 1) data poisoning where \mathcal{A} manipulates local training dataset(s) D_{local}^i used to train the local model [31, 41], and 2) model poisoning where \mathcal{A} manipulates the local training process or the trained local models themselves [1]. In this work, we follow the data poisoning to implement backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs.

3 Problem Formulation

3.1 Overview

FL is a practical choice to push machine learning to users’ devices, e.g., smart speakers, cars, and phones. Usually, federated learning is designed to work with thousands or even millions of users without restrictions on eligibility [1]. This means that training machine learning models on users’ devices creates a new attack threat when some users are malicious. As stated in [3], training with multiple malicious clients is now considered a practical threat by the designers of federated learning.

Because of the data privacy guarantee among the clients in the federated learning, local clients can modify their local training dataset without being noticed. Furthermore, existing federated learning frameworks do not provide a functionality to verify whether the training on local clients has been finished correctly. Consequently, one or more clients can submit their malicious models trained for the assigned task and backdoor functionality.

3.2 Threat Model

Unlike traditional machine learning benchmarking datasets, graph datasets and real-world graphs may exhibit non-independent and identical distribution (non-i.i.d) due to factors like structure and feature heterogeneity [17]. Therefore, following the FL assumptions, we assume that graphs among K clients are non-i.i.d. distributed. Additionally, the clients engaging in training can be divided into honest and malicious clients. All clients strictly follow the FL training process, but the malicious client(s) will inject graph trigger(s) into their training graphs. We also assume the server is conducting model aggregation correctly. Our primary focus is to investigate backdoor attack effectiveness on Federated GNNs, so we adopt two backdoor attack methods as defined below.

Definition 1 (Distributed Backdoor Attack (DBA).)

There are multiple malicious clients, and each of them has its local trigger. The local triggers are injected into multiple malicious clients’ local training datasets. All malicious clients have the same backdoor task. An adversary \mathcal{A} conducts DBA by compromising at least two clients in FL.

Definition 2 (Centralized Backdoor Attack (CBA).)

A global trigger consisting of local triggers is injected into one client’s local training dataset. An adversary \mathcal{A} conducts CBA by usually compromising only one client in FL.

Adversary’s capability. We assume the adversary \mathcal{A} can corrupt at most K clients to perform DBA. We perform a complete attack in every round, i.e., the attacker consistently performs a backdoor attack, following the attack setting in [41]. However, the adversary cannot impact the aggregation process on the central server, nor the training process or model updates of other clients.

Adversary’s knowledge. We assume that the adversary \mathcal{A} knows compromised clients’ training dataset and the distribution of the complete dataset. In this context, the adversary can generate local triggers by following Algorithm 3. More specifically, the attacker samples the local training dataset of the non-target label with poisoning rate r and injects trigger graph into the sampled dataset. Additionally, the attacker relabels the sampled dataset with an attacker-chosen target label.

Besides, we follow the original assumptions of FL. The number of clients participating in training, model structure, aggregation strategy, and global model of each iteration is revealed to all clients, including malicious clients.

Adversary’s goal. Unlike some non-targeted attacks [32] aiming to deteriorate the accuracy of the model, the backdoor attacks studied in this paper aim to make the global model misclassify the backdoored data samples into specific pre-determined labels (i.e., target label y_t) while not affecting the accuracy on clean data samples.

In distributed backdoor attacks, each malicious client injects its local trigger into its local training dataset to poison the local model. Therefore, DBA can fully leverage the power of FL in aggregating dispersed information from local models to train a poisoned global model. Assuming there are M malicious clients in DBA, each has its local trigger. Each malicious client i in DBA independently implements a backdoor attack on its local model. The adversarial objective for each malicious client i is:

$$w_t^{i*} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w_t^i} \left(\sum_{j \in D_{trigger}^i} \ell(w_{t-1}^i(\Phi(x_j^i, \kappa^i), y_t)) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j \in D_{clean}^i} \ell(w_{t-1}^i(x_j^i, y_j^i)) \right), \forall i \in [M]. \quad (4)$$

where the poisoned training dataset $D_{trigger}^i$ and clean training dataset D_{clean}^i satisfy $D_{trigger}^i \cup D_{clean}^i = D_{local}^i$ and $D_{trigger}^i \cap D_{clean}^i = \emptyset$. D_{local}^i is the local training dataset of client i . Φ is the function that transforms the clean data with non-target label into poisoned data using a set of trigger generation parameters κ^i . In this paper, κ^i consists of trigger size s , trigger density ρ , and poisoning intensity r : $\kappa = \{s, \rho, r\}$. The detailed explanation of these parameters is in Section 4.2. We will explore the related backdoored data generation factors in Section 5.4.

Unlike DBA, in which there are multiple malicious clients, there is only one malicious client in CBA¹. CBA is conducted by embedding a global trigger into a malicious client’s training dataset. The global trigger is a graph consisting of local trigger graphs used in DBA as explained further in Section 4.1. Formally, the adversarial objective of the attacker k in round t in CBA is:

$$w_t^{k*} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w_t^k} \left(\sum_{j \in D_{trigger}^k} \ell(w_{t-1}^k(\Phi(x_j^k, \kappa), y_t)) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j \in D_{clean}^k} \ell(w_{t-1}^k(x_j^k, y_j^k)) \right), \quad (5)$$

where κ is the combination of κ^i .

Finally, utilizing the power of FL in message passing from local models to the global model, the global model is supposed to inherit the backdoor functionality.

4 Backdoor Attacks against Federated GNNs

4.1 General Framework

This section gives a general design description of backdoor attacks against Federated GNNs. We focus on subgraph-based (data poisoning) backdoor attacks and the graph classification task. To perform a subgraph-based backdoor attack on GNNs, the adversary needs to generate graph trigger(s). We adopt the Erdős-Rényi (ER) model [13] generating triggers for attackers. Attackers can perform DBA or CBA according to different scenarios and security assumptions. In the former, multiple malicious clients engage in attacking and inject local triggers into corresponding malicious clients’ local training datasets. The latter is conducted with only one malicious client, whose training data is poisoned with the global trigger that consists of local triggers used in DBA. We provide the notations used throughout the paper in Table 1.

Figure 2 illustrates the framework of two backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs - distributed backdoor attack and centralized backdoor attack.

Distributed Backdoor Attack. For the distributed backdoor attack in Federated GNNs, we assume there are M malicious clients among K clients in total, as shown in Figure 2(a). Each malicious client embeds its local training dataset with a specific graph trigger to poison its local model. For instance, in Figure 2(a), each malicious client has a local trigger highlighted by a specific color

¹In practice, the centralized attack can poison more than one client with the same global trigger, as mentioned in [1]. Here, we assume there is one malicious client




Figure 2: Attack Framework.

(i.e., orange, green, red, yellow)². Through training with these poisoned training datasets, the poisoned local models are uploaded to the server to update the global model. The final adversarial goal is to use the global trigger to attack the global model. We define each malicious client’s graph trigger as the local trigger and the combined whole trigger as the global trigger. Algorithms 1 and 2 illustrate the distributed backdoor attack in Federated GNNs. We conduct experiments for both malicious majority and honest majority settings to explore the impact of different percentages of malicious clients on the attack success rate. We provide additional motivation for considering malicious majority setting in Section 6.

Centralized Backdoor Attack. Unlike DBA conducted with multiple malicious clients, CBA usually performs the attack by only one malicious client. CBA is a general approach in a centralized learning scenario. For example, in an image classification model, the attacker poisons the training dataset with a certain trigger so that the model will misclassify the data sample with the same trigger into the attacker-chosen label. As shown in Figure 2(b), the malicious client embeds its training dataset with the global trigger highlighted by four colors. This global trigger consists of local triggers used in DBA, as shown in Line 5 of Algorithm 2. Specifically, the attacker in CBA embeds its training data with four local patterns, which together constitute a complete global pattern as the backdoor trigger³

In this paper, to compare the attack performance between the distributed backdoor attack and centralized backdoor attack in Federated GNNs, we need to make sure the trigger pattern in CBA is the union set of local trigger patterns in DBA. We can use two strategies: 1) first generate local triggers in DBA and then combine

²Although we here use the triangle as the graph trigger for each malicious client, in practice the local trigger are more complex and different from each other.

³Here, the four colors are only used to denote four trigger patterns.

Table 1: Notations used in this paper.

Notations	Descriptions
y_t	target label
G_t	joint global model at round t
E	local epochs
K	number of clients
M	number of malicious clients
C_h, C_m	honest clients, malicious clients
D_{local}	client’s local training dataset splitted from dataset D_{train}
D_{test}	testing dataset splitted from dataset D
t_{global}	global trigger
t_{local}	local trigger
w_t^k	client k ’s local trained model at round t
r	poisoning ratio
s	number of nodes in graph trigger
ρ	edge existence probability in graph trigger
$D_{trigger}$	dataset with trigger embedded
D_{clean}	clean training dataset
$D_{backdoor}$	backdoored training dataset
B	local minibatch size
η	learning rate

them to get the global trigger, or 2) first generate a global trigger in CBA and then divide it into M local triggers. We utilize the first strategy as it is an NP-hard problem to divide a graph into several subgraphs [8]. Thus, in different attack scenarios (i.e., honest majority or malicious majority attack scenarios), the CBA performance is different since the global trigger has been changed due to the different number of malicious clients.

4.2 Backdoored Data Generation

As mentioned in Section 4.1, we use Erdős-Rényi (ER) model to generate the graph trigger. The process of backdoored data generation is illustrated in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 1: Distributed Backdoor Attacks in Federated GNNs

Input: Dataset D , Target label y_t
Output: Backdoored Global model G_{t+1} , global trigger t_{global}

```
1 Function DBA():
2    $C_h, C_m \leftarrow ClientSplit(Clients)$ 
3    $D_{local}, D_{test} \leftarrow DataSplit(D)$ 
4    $t_{global} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5   Server executes:
6   initialize  $G_0, f = False$ 
7   foreach round  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  do
8     foreach client  $k \in (C_h \cup C_m)$  do
9        $w_t^k = G_t$ 
10      if  $k \in C_m$  then
11         $f = True$ 
12      end
13       $w_{t+1}^k \leftarrow ClientUpdate(k, w_t^k, f, t_{global})$ 
14    end
15     $G_{t+1} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{w_{t+1}^k}{K}$ 
16  end
17 End Function
18 return  $G_{t+1}, t_{global}$ 
```

Algorithm 2: ClientUpdate

Input: Client k , Local training dataset D_{local} , Current global model w , flag f , global trigger t_{global}
Output: Updated model w

```
1 Function ClientUpdate():
2   if  $f$  is  $True$  then
3      $t_{local} \leftarrow GenerateTrigger(s, \rho)$ 
4      $D_{local} \leftarrow BackdoorDataset(D_{local}, t_{local}, y_t)$ 
5      $t_{global} = t_{global} \cup t_{local}$ 
6   end
7    $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow (\text{split } D_{local} \text{ into batches of size } B)$ 
8   foreach local epoch  $i$  from 1 to  $E$  do
9     foreach  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  do
10       $w \leftarrow w - \eta \nabla l(w, b)$ 
11    end
12  end
13 End Function
14 return  $w$ 
```

There are several important factors for the generation of backdoored data: trigger size s , trigger density ρ , and poisoning intensity r [49].

Trigger Size s : the number of nodes of a local graph trigger. Here, we set the trigger size s to be the γ fraction of the graph dataset’s average number of nodes.

Trigger Density ρ : the complexity of a local graph trigger, which ranges from 0 to 1 and is used in the Erdős-Rényi (ER) model to generate the graph trigger.

Poisoning Intensity r : the ratio that controls the percentage of backdoored training dataset among the local training dataset.

Since these factors affect the attack performance dramatically, we explore their impact in 5.4.

Algorithm 3: BackdoorDataset

Input: Local Training Dataset $D_{local} = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^S$, Target label $y_t \in [0, C]$, local trigger t_{local}
Output: Backdoored Training Dataset $D_{backdoor}$

```
1 Function BackdoorDataset():
2    $D_{trigger} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3    $D_{imp} \leftarrow sample(D_{local}, r, y \neq y_t)$ 
4    $D_{clean} = \{data \in D_{local} : data \notin D_{imp}\}$ 
5   foreach  $d \in D_{imp}$  do
6      $x = AddTrigger(d[x], t_{local})$ 
7      $y = y_t$ 
8      $D_{trigger} = D_{trigger} \cup \{x, y\}$ 
9   end
10 End Function
11  $D_{backdoor} = D_{clean} \cup D_{trigger}$ 
12 return  $D_{backdoor}$ 
```

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setting

We implemented federated learning algorithms using the PyTorch framework. All experiments were run on a server with 2 Intel Xeon CPUs, one NVIDIA 1080 Ti GPU with 32GB RAM, and Ubuntu 20.04 LTS OS. Each experiment was repeated ten times to obtain the average result.

Dataset. We use three publicly available graph datasets: MOLT-4H [44], NCI1 [29], and PROTEINS_full [4]. Table 2 provides the detailed statistics for these datasets.

Dataset splits. For each dataset, we randomly sample 80% of the data instances as the training dataset and the rest as the testing dataset. The training dataset is further split into K parts and assigned to K different clients as the local training dataset. As mentioned in Section 4.2, the backdoored data is generated according to several parameters: trigger size s , trigger density ρ , and poisoning

Table 2: Datasets statistics.

Datasets	# Graphs	Avg. # nodes	Avg. # edges	Classes	Class Distribution
MOLT-4H	39,765	46.70	48.73	2	36,625[0], 3,140[1]
NCII	4,110	29.87	32.30	2	2,053[0], 2,057[1]
PROTEINS_full	1,113	39,06	72.82	2	663[0], 450[1]

intensity r . We set the trigger size s as γ fraction of the graph dataset’s average number of nodes. Once the graph trigger is generated, we sample the r fraction of the local training dataset (with non-target label) to embed the graph trigger. In this paper, except in Section 5.4 where we analyze the effect of trigger factors, we set trigger factors as follows: $\gamma = 0.2$, $\rho = 0.8$, and $r = 0.2$, according to the tuning results from the ablation study.

Models and evaluation metrics. In our experiments, we use four state-of-the-art GNN models: GCN [21], GAT [36], GraphSAGE [15], and GatedGCN [5].

We use the *attack success rate (ASR)* to evaluate the attack effectiveness, as shown in Algorithm 4. Specifically, we embed the testing dataset with local triggers or the global trigger and then calculate the ASR of the global model on the poisoned testing dataset. Here, we only embed the testing dataset of the non-target label with triggers to avoid the influence of the original label. The ASR measures the proportion of trigger-embedded inputs that are misclassified by the backdoored GNN into the target class y_t chosen by the adversary. The trigger-embedded inputs are

$$D_{g_t} = \{(G_{1,g_t}, y_1), (G_{2,g_t}, y_2), \dots, (G_{n,g_t}, y_n)\}.$$

Here, g_t is the graph trigger, $\{G_{1,g_t}, G_{2,g_t}, \dots, G_{n,g_t}\}$ is the testing dataset embedded with graph trigger g_t , and y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n is the label set.

Formally, the ASR is defined as:

$$\text{Attack Success Rate} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(G_{\text{backdoor}}(G_{i,g_t}) = y_t)}{n},$$

where \mathbb{I} is an indicator function and G_{backdoor} refers to the backdoored global model. Here, the graph trigger g_t can be local triggers or the global trigger.

5.2 Backdoor Attack Results

We evaluate multiple-shot attack [1], which means that the attackers perform attacks in multiple rounds, and the malicious updates are accumulated to achieve a successful backdoor attack. As mentioned in Section 3.2, we perform a complete attack in every round, which can show the difference between DBA and CBA in a shorter time [41].

We evaluate the honest majority and malicious majority attack scenarios according to the percentage of malicious clients among all clients. Specifically, we set

Algorithm 4: Evaluate Backdoor Attack

Input: Global Model G_t , Testing Dataset D_{test} , Target label y_t , graph trigger g_t

Output: Attack Success Rate ASR

```

1 Function Evaluation():
2    $D_{\text{tmp}} \leftarrow d \in D_{\text{test}}$  if  $d[y] \neq y_t$ 
3   foreach  $d \in D_{\text{tmp}}$  do
4      $x = \text{AddTrigger}(d[x], g_t)$ 
5      $y = y_t$ 
6      $D_{\text{tmp}} = D_{\text{tmp}} \cup \{x, y\}$ 
7   end
8 End Function
9  $ASR = \text{accuracy}(G_t, D_{\text{tmp}})$ 
10 return  $ASR$ 

```

two and three malicious clients among five clients for the honest majority and malicious majority attack scenarios, respectively. Here, we set five clients in total due to the dataset size, e.g., less than 2,000 in PROTEINS_full. Each local model will have a smaller training dataset with more clients, leading to severe overfitting.

In our experiments, we evaluate the attack success rate of CBA and DBA with the global trigger and local triggers. The goal is to explore:

- In CBA, whether the attack success rate of local triggers can achieve similar performance to the global trigger even if the centralized attacker would embed a global trigger into the model?
- In DBA, whether the attack success rate of the global trigger is higher than all local triggers even if the global trigger never actually appears in any local training dataset, as mentioned in [41]?

Honest Majority Attack Scenario. The attack results of CBA and DBA in the honest majority attack scenario are shown in Figure 3. As we can see from the figure, the DBA attack success rate with a specific kind of trigger is always higher than or at least similar to that of CBA with the corresponding kind of trigger. For example, in Figure 3b, the result for the GAT model, the DBA attack success rate with the global trigger is higher than CBA with a global trigger. *Based on the result for CBA, surprisingly, we find that the attack success rate of all local triggers can be as high as the global trigger even if in CBA, the centralized attacker embeds global trigger into the model, which is not consistent with the phenomenon in [41].* We analyze this phenomenon through further

experiments, shown in Figure 6.

Moreover, in DBA, only the results for the PROTEINS_full dataset show that the attack success rate of the global trigger is higher than any local trigger, even if the global trigger never actually appears in any local training dataset. The only exception happens for the GatedGCN model. This indicates that the high attack success rate of the global trigger does not require the same high attack success rate of local triggers. However, for the other datasets, the attack success rate of the global trigger is close to all local triggers. This indicates that the local trigger embedded in local models can successfully transfer to the global model so that once any local trigger is activated, the global model will misclassify the data sample into the attacker-chosen target label.

Malicious Majority Attack Scenario To explore the impact of different percentages of malicious clients on the attack performance, we experiment with a malicious majority attack scenario where we assume three malicious clients out of the total of five clients. The attack results are presented in Figure 4. Compared with the honest majority attack scenario, in most cases, the difference between the attack success rate for DBA and CBA with the same trigger is more obvious. For instance, based on the NCI1 dataset and GraphSage model, the DBA attack success rate with the global trigger in the honest majority attack scenario is 3.85% higher than CBA. At the same time, in the malicious majority attack scenario, the ASR difference is 10.33%.

Moreover, with more malicious clients, in most cases, the DBA attack success rates are higher for all datasets. Especially, there is a significant increase for the PROTEINS_full dataset (cf. Figures 3c and 4c). This can be explained that with more malicious clients, more malicious updates are uploaded to the global model so that the attack is more effective and persistent. For CBA, the attack success rate with the global trigger is higher while the attack performance with local triggers stays at a similar level or even decreases. One possible reason is that more malicious clients mean a larger global trigger, requiring more learning capacity of the model. If there is not enough learning capacity for every local trigger in the global trigger, the backdoored model can have poor attack performance with a specific local trigger but will behave well with the union set of the local triggers, i.e., the global trigger.

Impact of the Percentage of Malicious Clients Although we have analyzed the experiments with the honest majority and malicious majority scenarios, we further explore the impact of the percentage of malicious clients on the attack performance by calculating their correlation coefficient (cc), as shown in Figure 5. Recall, M represents the number of malicious clients, and each number over the line is the corresponding correlation coefficient.

As we can see from Figure 5, for NCI1 and PROTEINS_full, cc in DBA is larger than CBA, meaning the increase in M has a more positive impact on DBA than CBA. This is intuitive because more malicious clients in DBA means more local models are embedded with local triggers, while in CBA, it means a larger global trigger due to more local triggers. Specifically, in DBA, more malicious clients mean more model weights to learn the trigger, but in CBA, there is only one attacker, and learning a larger global trigger can be out of the model’s representation capability. The small cc value for Molt-4H happens since the attack is always successful so more malicious clients is not beneficial.

Analysis of CBA results In Figure 3, for CBA, the attack success rate of all local triggers can be as high as the global trigger, which is counterintuitive as the centralized attack only embeds the global trigger into the model. To explain these results, we further implement an experiment where we evaluate the attack success rate of the global trigger and local triggers in both malicious local model⁴ and the global model. As shown in Figure 6, in the malicious local model, the attack success rate of all local triggers is already close to the global trigger, which means that the malicious local model has learned the pattern of each local trigger. After aggregation, the global model inherits the capacity of local models. Once any local trigger exists, the global model will misclassify the data sample into the attacker-chosen target label.

Nevertheless, in [41], for the CBA, the attack success rate of all local triggers is significantly lower than the global trigger. In [41], the malicious local model learns the global trigger instead of each local trigger, so the poisoned model can only misclassify the data sample once there is a global trigger in the data. The different results in CBA between [41] and our work can be explained since in [41], the local triggers composing the global trigger are located close to each other (i.e., less than three pixels distance [41]). While in our work, the location of local triggers is random because a graph is non-Euclidean data where we cannot put nodes in some order. Therefore, when the local trigger graphs are further away from each other, the malicious local model in CBA can only learn the local trigger instead of the global trigger.

5.3 Clean Accuracy Drop

The goal of the backdoor attack is to make the backdoored model simultaneously fit the main task and backdoor task. Therefore, it is critical that after training with the poisoned data, the trained model can still behave

⁴For the centralized backdoor attack, we assume there is one centralized attacker, so there is only one local model which will be poisoned and we define this model as the malicious local model




Figure 3: Backdoor attack results in the honest majority attack scenario.

normally on untampered data samples. Here, we use *clean accuracy drop (CAD)* to evaluate whether the backdoored model can still fit the original main task. CAD is the classification accuracy difference between global models with and without malicious clients over the clean testing dataset.

CBA and DBA’s final clean accuracy drop results in the honest majority and malicious majority attack scenarios are given in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. We can observe that in most cases, both CBA and DBA have low clean accuracy drop, i.e., around 2%, and only in a few cases, there is significant clean accuracy drop, as shown in Appendix A. These results imply that the centralized backdoor attack and distributed backdoor attack can evade detection effectively.

5.4 Ablation Study

This section studies the backdoored data generation factors discussed in Section 4.2. We only modify one fac-

tor for each experiment and keep other factors the same as in Section 5.1. For each dataset, we provide the results for the GraphSage model as an example as those results are more stable, i.e., have the smallest standard error. We note that the results for other models are similar to GraphSage. For each factor, we evaluate the attack success rate of the global trigger and the testing accuracy on the clean testing dataset. Here, we illustrate the results of a distributed backdoor attack in the malicious majority attack scenario to analyze the effects of each factor. The results for other attack scenarios are aligned.

Effects of Trigger Size The attack success rate and testing accuracy with different trigger size values are shown in Figure 7. As we can see from the ASR results in Figure 7, a larger trigger size gives a higher attack success rate in DBA, e.g., an obvious increase for NCI1 when γ rises from 0.15 to 0.20. However, when γ is larger than 0.25, ASR is steady or even has a decline for PROTEINS_full, indicating there is no necessity to use too large triggers. There is no significant effect of




Figure 4: Backdoor attack results in the malicious majority attack scenario.

Table 3: Clean accuracy drop of CBA and DBA in the honest majority attack scenario.

CAD(%)	GCN		GAT		GraphSage		GatedGCN	
	CBA	DBA	CBA	DBA	CBA	DBA	CBA	DBA
MOLT-4H	1.81	1.04	0.03	0.15	0.55	0.87	0.18	0.32
NCI1	2.73	3.87	0.37	1.75	0.91	0.53	2.70	6.45
PROTEINS_full	0.19	2.50	0.72	0.87	3.23	1.82	5.03	6.04

Table 4: Clean accuracy drop of CBA and DBA in the malicious majority attack scenario.

CAD(%)	GCN		GAT		GraphSage		GatedGCN	
	CBA	DBA	CBA	DBA	CBA	DBA	CBA	DBA
MOLT-4H	0.97	1.68	0.57	1.20	0.21	1.79	0.20	0.52
NCI1	2.21	2.50	0.43	0.16	1.74	0.91	3.80	7.93
PROTEINS_full	2.13	0.65	3.44	6.15	0.99	0.85	4.74	7.20




Figure 5: Correlation between ASR and M .




Figure 6: Centralized backdoor attack results on the malicious local model and global model with different triggers.

trigger size on the testing accuracy of the global model, implying that in DBA, the trigger size has little impact on the original main task.

Effects of Trigger Density As we can see from Figure 8, ASR for NCI1 improves from 64.9% to 90.8% when trigger density increases from 0.20 to 0.50. This is because the average complexity of the NCI1 dataset is 0.15 [33]. If the trigger density is set close to this value, the difference between the original graph and trigger graph is hard to distinguish. Still, the testing accuracy of the global model has negligible fluctuation with the increase of trigger density. We leave as a future challenge to explain why we do not see such behavior in the other cases.

Effects of Poisoning Intensity The effects of poisoning intensity on ASR and testing accuracy of the global model are presented in Figure 9. As the X-axis value

(poisoning intensity) increases from 0.15 to 0.3, ASR for NCI1 first has a large increase and then remains stable. Intuitively, a backdoor attack can perform better with more poisoned data. However, too large poison ratios mean that the malicious local models spend more time learning the backdoor task (i.e., less time on the main task), leading to the failure of the global model in the main task. For example, in NCI1, the testing accuracy drops from 82.5% to 78.6%.

As we can see in Figures 7 and 8, there is no significant drop in the testing accuracy with an increase in the trigger size and trigger density. On the contrary, in the backdoor attacks in centralized GNNs [43], as trigger size increases, the testing accuracy decreases. This can be explained as, in FL, the influence of backdoor functionality on the main task is weakened by the aggregation of local models.

6 Related Work

Backdoor Attacks in GNNs Several recent works have conducted backdoor attacks on GNNs. Zhang et al. proposed a subgraph-based backdoor attack on GNNs for the graph classification task [49]. Xi et al. presented a subgraph-based backdoor attack on GNNs, where this attack could be instantiated for both node classification and graph classification tasks [40]. Xu et al. [43] investigated the explainability of the impact of the trigger injecting position on the performance of backdoor attacks on GNNs, and proposed a new backdoor attack strategy for the node classification task. *All current attacks are implemented in centralized training for GNNs. There is no work exploring the backdoor attacks in distributed training for GNNs, e.g., Federated GNNs.*

Federated Learning on GNNs FL has gained increasing attention as a training paradigm where data are distributed at remote devices and models are collaboratively trained in a central server. While the FL has been widely studied in Euclidean data, e.g., images, texts, and sound, there are increasing studies about FL in graph data. FL on graph data was firstly introduced in [23], where each client is regarded as a node in a graph. When it comes to detecting financial crimes (e.g., fraud or money laundering), traditional machine learning tends to lead to severe overreporting of suspicious activities. Thanks to the reasoning ability of the graph neural network, its advantages can be well-reflected. Considering the need for privacy, [35] proposed the framework for Federated GNNs to optimize the machine learning model. Besides, other research works [19, 50, 38] have been dedicated to enhancing the security of Federated GNNs. Specifically, by using secure aggregation, [19] proposed a method to predict the trajectories of objects via aggregating both spatial and dynamic information without information leak-




Figure 7: Effects of trigger size on attack success rate and testing accuracy.




Figure 8: Effects of trigger density on attack success rate and testing accuracy.




Figure 9: Effects of poisoning intensity on attack success rate and testing accuracy.

age. Furthermore, by using differential privacy, [50] and [38] put forward a framework to train Federated GNNs for vertical Federated Learning and recommendation system, respectively. Moreover, SpreadGNN was proposed in [18] to perform FL without a server. *Although there is an increasing number of works on FL for graph data, the vulnerability of Federated GNNs to backdoor attacks is still not sufficiently explored.*

The Security Assumption of Malicious Majority Clients Recently, Cao et al. took into account the situation of backdoor attacks in the malicious majority of clients and proposed a method of defense-*FLTrust* [6]. Before training begins, an honest server collects and trains on a small dataset. The server takes the updates obtained by training on a small dataset as the root of trust in each iteration. It is then compared to the updates uploaded by the clients. If the cosine similarity between them is too small, the updates will be filtered out. With this approach, the accuracy of the global model remains equivalent to that of the baseline. Based on *FLTrust*, Dong et al. considered setting of two semi-honest servers and malicious majority clients and proposed *FLOD* to ensure that gradients are not leaked on server side [9].

7 Conclusions and Future Work

This paper explores how backdoor attacks behave in Federated GNNs: Centralized Backdoor Attack and Dis-

tributed Backdoor Attack. Through extensive experiments on three real-world datasets and four popular GNN models, we showed that generally, DBA achieves a higher attack success rate than CBA. Interestingly, CBA can reach a similar performance to DBA in some cases. We showed that in CBA, the attack success rate of local triggers could be as high as the global trigger even if in the training phase only global trigger is embedded in the model. The impact of the percentage of malicious clients on ASR of DBA is analyzed with correlation, where we confirm the intuition that more malicious clients lead to more successful attacks. We also analyzed the critical backdoored data generation factors to explore their impact on the attack performance and the main task. We find trigger density is the most influential one. We consider our work to provide novel insights for exploring adversarial attacks in Federated GNNs, a domain unexplored before our work.

For future work, we plan to demonstrate the robustness of DBA and CBA against state-of-art defense mechanisms, e.g., [34, 30]. We also plan to explore backdoor attacks in Federated GNNs for the node classification task. For example, in a social media app where each user has a local social network G^k and $\{G^k\}$ constitutes the latent entire human social network G , the developers can train a fraud detection GNN model through federated learning. In such a case, an attacker can conduct a backdoor attack to force the trained global model to classify a fraud node as benign.

References


- [1] Eugene Bagdasaryan, Andreas Veit, Yiqing Hua, Deborah Estrin, and Vitaly Shmatikov. How to backdoor federated learning. In *AISTATS*. PMLR, 2020.
- [2] Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Supriyo Chakraborty, Prateek Mittal, and Seraphin Calo. Analyzing federated learning through an adversarial lens. In *ICML*. PMLR, 2019.
- [3] Keith Bonawitz, Hubert Eichner, Wolfgang Grieskamp, et al. Towards federated learning at scale: System design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01046*, 2019.
- [4] Karsten M Borgwardt, Cheng Soon Ong, Stefan Schönauer, et al. Protein function prediction via graph kernels. *Bioinformatics*, 21, 2005.
- [5] Xavier Bresson and Thomas Laurent. Residual gated graph convnets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.07553*, 2017.
- [6] Xiaoyu Cao, Minghong Fang, Jia Liu, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Fltrust: Byzantine-robust federated learning via trust bootstrapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.13995*, 2020.
- [7] Dawei Cheng, Fangzhou Yang, Sheng Xiang, and Jin Liu. Financial time series forecasting with multi-modality graph neural network. *Pattern Recognition*, 2022.
- [8] Sanjoy Dasgupta, Christos H Papadimitriou, and Umesh Virkumar Vazirani. *Algorithms*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education New York, 2008.
- [9] Ye Dong, Xiaojun Chen, Kaiyun Li, Dakui Wang, and Shuai Zeng. Flod: Oblivious defender for private byzantine-robust federated learning with dishonest-majority. In Elisa Bertino, Haya Shulman, and Michael Waidner, editors, *Computer Security – ESORICS 2021*, 2021.
- [10] Shaohua Fan, Junxiong Zhu, Xiaotian Han, et al. Metapath-guided heterogeneous graph neural network for intent recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2019.
- [11] Wenqi Fan, Yao Ma, Qing Li, Yuan He, Eric Zhao, Jiliang Tang, and Dawei Yin. Graph neural networks for social recommendation. In *WWW*, 2019.
- [12] Minghong Fang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Gong. Local model poisoning attacks to byzantine-robust federated learning. In *USENIX Security*, 2020.
- [13] E. N. Gilbert. Random graphs. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 30(4):1141–1144, 1959.
- [14] Zhiwei Guo and Heng Wang. A deep graph neural network-based mechanism for social recommendations. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 17(4):2776–2783, 2020.
- [15] William L Hamilton, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [16] Andrew Hard, Kanishka Rao, Rajiv Mathews, et al. Federated learning for mobile keyboard prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03604*, 2018.
- [17] Chaoyang He, Keshav Balasubramanian, Emir Ceyani, Carl Yang, Han Xie, Lichao Sun, Lifang He, Liangwei Yang, Philip S. Yu, Yu Rong, Peilin Zhao, Junzhou Huang, Murali Annavaram, and Salman Avestimehr. Fedgraphnn: A federated learning system and benchmark for graph neural networks, 2021.
- [18] Chaoyang He, Emir Ceyani, Keshav Balasubramanian, Murali Annavaram, and Salman Avestimehr. Spreadgnn: Serverless multi-task federated learning for graph neural networks, 2021.
- [19] Meng Jiang, Taeho Jung, Ryan Karl, and Tong Zhao. Federated dynamic gnn with secure aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07351*, 2020.
- [20] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04977*, 2019.
- [21] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- [22] Anusha Lalitha, Osman Cihan Kilinc, Tara Javidi, and Farinaz Koushanfar. Peer-to-peer federated learning on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.11173*, 2019.
- [23] Anusha Lalitha, Osman Cihan Kilinc, Tara Javidi, and Farinaz Koushanfar. Peer-to-peer federated learning on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.11173*, 2019.

- [24] Jaechang Lim, Seongok Ryu, Kyubyong Park, Yo Joong Choe, Jiyeon Ham, and Woo Youn Kim. Predicting drug–target interaction using a novel graph neural network with 3d structure-embedded graph representation. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 59(9):3981–3988, 2019.
- [25] Fenglin Liu, Xian Wu, Shen Ge, Wei Fan, and Yuexian Zou. Federated learning for vision-and-language grounding problems. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [26] Yang Liu, Anbu Huang, Yun Luo, He Huang, Youzhi Liu, Yuanyuan Chen, Lican Feng, Tianjian Chen, Han Yu, and Qiang Yang. Fedvision: An online visual object detection platform powered by federated learning. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [27] Yingqi Liu, Shiqing Ma, Yousra Aafer, Wen-Chuan Lee, Juan Zhai, Weihang Wang, and Xiangyu Zhang. Trojaning attack on neural networks. In *25th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2018, San Diego, California, USA, February 18-21, 2018*. The Internet Society, 2018.
- [28] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *AISTATS*. PMLR, 2017.
- [29] Christopher Morris, Nils M Kriege, Franka Bause, Kristian Kersting, Petra Mutzel, and Marion Neumann. Tudataset: A collection of benchmark datasets for learning with graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08663*, 2020.
- [30] Thien Duc Nguyen, Phillip Rieger, Huili Chen, et al. Flame: Taming backdoors in federated learning, 2022.
- [31] Thien Duc Nguyen, Phillip Rieger, Markus Miettinen, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. Poisoning attacks on federated learning-based iot intrusion detection system. In *Proc. Workshop Decentralized IoT Syst. Secur.(DISS)*, 2020.
- [32] Omid Poursaeed, Isay Katsman, Bicheng Gao, and Serge Belongie. Generative adversarial perturbations. In *CVPR*, 2018.
- [33] Pavel Pudlák, Vojtěch Rödl, and Petr Savický. Graph complexity. *Acta Informatica*, 25(5):515–535, 1988.
- [34] Phillip Rieger, Thien Duc Nguyen, Markus Miettinen, and Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi. Deepsight: Mitigating backdoor attacks in federated learning through deep model inspection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00763*, 2022.
- [35] Toyotaro Suzumura, Yi Zhou, Natahalie Baracaldo, et al. Towards federated graph learning for collaborative financial crimes detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12946*, 2019.
- [36] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph Attention Networks. *ICLR*, 2018.
- [37] Daixin Wang, Jianbin Lin, Peng Cui, Quanhui Jia, Zhen Wang, Yanming Fang, Quan Yu, Jun Zhou, Shuang Yang, and Yuan Qi. A semi-supervised graph attentive network for financial fraud detection. In *ICDM*. IEEE, 2019.
- [38] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Yang Cao, Yongfeng Huang, and Xing Xie. Fedgnn: Federated graph neural network for privacy-preserving recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04925*, 2021.
- [39] Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- [40] Zhaohan Xi, Ren Pang, Shouling Ji, and Ting Wang. Graph backdoor. In *USENIX Security*, 2021.
- [41] Chulin Xie, Keli Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, and Bo Li. Dba: Distributed backdoor attacks against federated learning. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [42] Zhaoping Xiong, Dingyan Wang, Xiaohong Liu, et al. Pushing the boundaries of molecular representation for drug discovery with the graph attention mechanism. *Journal of medicinal chemistry*, 63(16):8749–8760, 2019.
- [43] Jing Xu, Minhui Xue, and Stjepan Picek. Explainability-based backdoor attacks against graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Workshop on Wireless Security and Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [44] Xifeng Yan, Hong Cheng, Jiawei Han, and Philip S Yu. Mining significant graph patterns by leap search. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, 2008.
- [45] Ruiping Yin, Kan Li, Guangquan Zhang, and Jie Lu. A deeper graph neural network for recommender systems. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 185:105020, 2019.


- [46] Rex Ying, Jiaxuan You, Christopher Morris, Xiang Ren, William L Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. Hierarchical graph representation learning with differentiable pooling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.08804*, 2018.
- [47] Huanding Zhang, Tao Shen, Fei Wu, Mingyang Yin, Hongxia Yang, and Chao Wu. Federated graph learning—a position paper. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.11099*, 2021.
- [48] Muhan Zhang, Zhicheng Cui, Marion Neumann, and Yixin Chen. An end-to-end deep learning architecture for graph classification. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [49] Zaixi Zhang, Jinyuan Jia, Binghui Wang, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Backdoor attacks to graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM Symposium on Access Control Models and Technologies*, 2021.
- [50] Jun Zhou, Chaochao Chen, Longfei Zheng, Huiwen Wu, Jia Wu, Xiaolin Zheng, Bingzhe Wu, Ziqi Liu, and Li Wang. Vertically federated graph neural network for privacy-preserving node classification, 2021.
- [51] Xinghua Zhu, Jianzong Wang, Zhenhou Hong, and Jing Xiao. Empirical studies of institutional federated learning for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, 2020.

A Testing Accuracy of Clean Model and Backdoored Model


Figures 10 and 11 show the testing accuracy of the clean model and backdoored models during the federated learning.



(a) MOLT-4H




(b) NCI1




(c) PROTEINS_full


Figure 10: Testing accuracy in the honest majority attack scenario.



(a) MOLT-4H



(b) NCI1



(c) PROTEINS_full

Figure 11: Testing accuracy in the honest majority attack scenario.