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## A1. SUPPLEMENT

## A. Proving the Separation Theorem

The Separation Theorem makes a statement about the cosine similarities between the gradients of the empirical risk functions $\nabla_{\theta} r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right)$ and $\nabla_{\theta} r_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)$, which are noisy approximations of the true risk gradients $\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)$, respective $\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(j)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)$. To simplify the notation let us first re-define

$$
\begin{equation*}
v_{l}=\nabla_{\theta} R_{l}\left(\theta^{*}\right), l=1, . ., k \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{i}=\nabla_{\theta} r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right), i=1, . ., m \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Figure A1 shows a possible configuration in $d=2$ with $k=3$ different data generating distributions and their corresponding gradients $v_{1}, v_{2}$ and $v_{3}$. The empirical risk gradients $X_{i}+v_{i(i)}$, $i=1, . ., m$ are shown as dashed lines. The maximum angles between gradients from the same data generating distribution are shown green, blue and purple in the plot. Among these, the green angle is the largest one $\varangle_{i n t r a}^{m a x}$. The plot also shows the optimal bi-partitioning into clusters 1 and 2 and the minimum angle between the gradient updates from any two clients in different clusters $\mathbb{\varangle}_{\text {cross }}^{\text {min }}$ is displayed in red. As long as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{\text {intra }}^{\max }<\varangle_{\text {cross }}^{\min } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

or equivalently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{\text {intra }}^{\min }=\cos \left(\varangle_{\text {intra }}^{\max }\right)>\cos \left(\Psi_{\text {cross }}^{\min }\right)=\alpha_{\text {cross }}^{\max } \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

the clustering will always be correct.
The proof of the Theorem can be organized into three separate steps:
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Fig. A1: Possible configuration in $d=2$ with $k=3$ different data generating distributions and their corresponding gradients $v_{1}, v_{2}$ and $v_{3}$. The empirical risk gradients $X_{i}+v_{i(i)}$, $i=1, . ., m$ are shown as dashed lines. The maximum angles between gradients from the same data generating distribution are shown green, blue and purple in the plot. Among these, the green angle is the largest one $\varangle_{\text {intra }}^{\max }$. The vectors are optimally bi-partitioned into clusters 1 and 2 and the minimum angle between the gradient updates from any two clients in different clusters $\varangle_{\text {cross }}^{\min }$ is displayed in red.

- In Lemma A1.1 we bound the cosine similarity between two noisy approximations of the same vector $\alpha_{\text {intra }}^{m i n}$ from below
- In Lemma A1.2, we bound the cosine similarity between two noisy approximations of two different vectors from above
- In Lemma A1.3, we show that every set of vectors that sums to zero can be separated into two groups such that the cosine similarity between any two vectors from separate groups can be bounded from above
- Lemma A1.2 and A1.3 together will allow us to bound the cross cluster similarity $\alpha_{\text {cross }}^{\max }$ from above
Lemma A1.1. Let $v, X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ with $\|X\|<\|v\|$ and $\|Y\|<$ $\|v\|$ then
$\alpha(v+X, v+Y) \geq-\frac{\|X\|\|Y\|}{\|v\|^{2}}+\sqrt{1-\frac{\|X\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}} \sqrt{1-\frac{\|Y\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}}$.

Proof: We are interested in vectors $X$ and $Y$ which maximize the angle between $v+X$ and $v+Y$. Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha(v+X, v+Y)=\cos (\varangle(v+X, v+Y)) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and cos is monotonically decreasing on $[0, \pi]$ such $X$ and $Y$ will minimize the cosine similarity $\alpha$. As $\|X\|<\|v\|$ and $\|Y\|<\|v\|$ the angle will be maximized if and only if $v$, $X$ and $Y$ share a common 2-dimensional hyperplane, $X$ is perpendicular to $v+X$ and $Y$ is perpendicular to $v+Y$ and $X$ and $Y$ point into opposite directions (Figure A2). It then holds by the trigonometric property of the sine that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sin (\varangle(v, v+X))=\frac{\|X\|}{\|v\|} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sin (\varangle(v, v+Y))=\frac{\|Y\|}{\|v\|} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{align*}
\cos (\varangle(v+X, v+Y)) & =\cos (\varangle(v+X)+\varangle(v+Y))  \tag{9}\\
& \geq \cos \left(\sin ^{-1}\left(\frac{\|X\|}{\|v\|}\right)+\sin ^{-1}\left(\frac{\|Y\|}{\|v\|}\right)\right) . \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\cos \left(\sin ^{-1}(x)+\sin ^{-1}(y)\right)=-x y+\sqrt{1-x^{2}} \sqrt{1-y^{2}} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

the result follows after re-arranging terms.

Lemma A1.2. Let $v, w, X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ with $\|X\|<\|v\|$, $\|Y\|<$ $\|w\|$ and define

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(v, w, X, Y):=-\frac{\|X\|\|Y\|}{\|v\|^{2}}+\sqrt{1-\frac{\|X\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}} \sqrt{1-\frac{\|Y\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$



Fig. A2: We are interested in a configuration for which the angle between $v+X$ and $v+Y$ is maximized (red in the plot). As $\|X\|<\|v\|$ and $\|Y\|<\|v\|$ this is exactly the case if the line $\{\beta(v+X) \mid \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is tangential to the circle with center $v$ and radius $\|X\|$ and the line $\{\beta(v+Y) \mid \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is tangential to the circle with center $v$ and radius $\|Y\|$.

## If

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\langle v, w\rangle}{\|v\|\|w\|} \leq h(v, w, X, Y) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

then it holds

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha(v+X, w+Y) \leq & \alpha(v, w) h(v, w, X, Y) \\
& +\sqrt{1-\alpha(v, w)^{2}} \sqrt{1-h(v, w, X, Y)^{2}} \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof: Analogously to the argument in Figure A2, the angle between $v+X$ and $w+Y$ is minimized, when $v, w$, $X$ and $Y$ share a common 2-dimensional hyperplane, $X$ is orthogonal to $v+X, Y$ is orthogonal to $w+Y$, and $X$ and $Y$ point towards each other. The minimum possible angle is
then given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\varangle(v+X, w+Y) & =\varangle(v, w)-\varangle(v, v+X)-\varangle(w, w+Y)  \tag{16}\\
& \geq \max (0,  \tag{17}\\
& \cos ^{-1}\left(\frac{\langle v, w\rangle}{\|v\|\|w\|}\right)  \tag{18}\\
- & \sin ^{-1}\left(\frac{\|X\|}{\|v\|}\right)+  \tag{19}\\
- & \left.\sin ^{-1}\left(\frac{\|Y\|}{\|v\|}\right)\right) \tag{20}
\end{align*}
$$

which can be simplified to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \varangle(v+X, w+Y) \geq \max \left(0, \cos ^{-1}\left(\frac{\langle v, w\rangle}{\|v\|\|w\|}\right)\right.  \tag{21}\\
& \left.\quad-\cos ^{-1}\left(-\frac{\|X\|\|Y\|}{\|v\|^{2}}+\sqrt{1-\frac{\|X\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}} \sqrt{1-\frac{\|Y\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}}\right)\right) \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

Under condition (13) then second term in the maximum is greater than zero and we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \cos (\varangle(v+X, v+Y))  \tag{23}\\
& \leq \cos \left(\cos ^{-1}\left(\frac{\langle v, w\rangle}{\|v\|\|w\|}\right)\right.  \tag{24}\\
& \left.\quad-\cos ^{-1}\left(-\frac{\|X\|\|Y\|}{\|v\|^{2}}+\sqrt{1-\frac{\|X\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}} \sqrt{1-\frac{\|Y\|^{2}}{\|v\|^{2}}}\right)\right)  \tag{25}\\
& \leq \cos \left(\cos ^{-1}(\alpha(v, w))-\cos ^{-1}(h(v, w, X, Y))\right) \tag{26}
\end{align*}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\cos \left(\cos ^{-1}(x)-\cos ^{-1}(y)\right)=x y+\sqrt{1-x^{2}} \sqrt{1-y^{2}} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

the result follows after re-arranging terms.
Lemma A1.3. Let $v_{1}, . ., v_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, d \geq 2, \gamma_{1}, . ., \gamma_{k} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{i} v_{i}=0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

then there exists a bi-partitioning of the vectors $c_{1} \cup c_{2}=$ $\{1, . ., k\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{i \in c_{1}, j \in c_{2}} \alpha\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \leq \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{k-1}\right) \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Proof:

Lemma A1.3 can be equivalently stated as follows:
Let $v_{1}, . ., v_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, d \geq 2, \gamma_{1}, . ., \gamma_{k} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_{i} v_{i}=0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

then there exists a bi-partitioning of the vectors $c_{1} \cup c_{2}=$ $\{1, . ., k\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{i \in c_{1}, j \in c_{2}} \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \geq \frac{\pi}{k-1} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

As the angle between two vectors is invariant under multiplication with positive scalars $\gamma>0$ we can assume w.l.o.g that $\gamma_{i}=1 i=1, . ., k$.

Let us first consider the case where $d=2$. Let $e_{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$ be the first standard basis vector and assume w.l.o.g that the vectors $v_{1}, . ., v_{k}$ are sorted w.r.t. their angular distance to $e_{1}$ (they are arranged circular as shows in Figure A3). As all vectors lie in the 2 d plane, we know that the sum of the angles between all neighboring vectors has to be equal to $2 \pi$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{(i+1) \bmod k}\right)=2 \pi \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now let

$$
\begin{equation*}
i_{1}^{*}=\arg \max _{i \in\{1, . ., k\}} \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{(i+1) \bmod k}\right) \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
i_{2}^{*}=\arg \max _{i \in\{1, \ldots, k\} \backslash i_{1}^{*}} \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{(i+1) \bmod k}\right) \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

be the indices of the largest and second largest angles between neighboring vectors and define the following clusters:

$$
\begin{align*}
& c_{1}=\left\{i \bmod k \mid i_{1}^{*}<i \leq i_{2}^{*}+k\left[i_{2}^{*}<i_{1}^{*}\right]\right\}  \tag{35}\\
& \left.c_{2}=\left\{i \bmod k \mid i_{2}^{*}<i \leq i_{1}^{*}+k\left[i_{2}^{*}>i_{1}^{*}\right]\right\}\right\} \tag{36}
\end{align*}
$$

where $[x]=1$ if $x$ is true and $[x]=0$ is $x$ is false. Then by construction the second largest angle $\varangle\left(v_{i_{2}^{*}}, v_{\left(i_{2}^{*}+1\right) \bmod k}\right)$ minimizes the angle between any two vectors from the two different clusters $c_{1}, c_{2}$ (see Figure A 3 for an illustration):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{i \in c_{1}, j \in c_{2}} \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)=\varangle\left(v_{i_{2}^{*}}, v_{\left(i_{2}^{*}+1\right) \bmod k}\right) \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence in $d=2$ we can always find a partitioning $c_{1}, c_{2}$ s.t. the minimum angle between any two vectors from different clusters is greater or equal to the 2 nd largest angle between neighboring vectors. This means the worst case configuration of vectors is one where the 2nd largest angle between neighboring vectors is minimized. As the sum of all $k$ angles between neighboring vectors is constant according to (32), this is exactly the case when the largest angle between neighboring vectors is maximized and all other $k-1$ angles are equal.

Assume now that the angle between two neighboring vectors is greater than $\pi$. That would mean that there exists a separating line $l$ which passes through the origin and all vectors $v_{1}, . ., v_{k}$ lie on one side of that line. This however is impossible since $\sum_{l=1}^{k} v_{l}=0$. This means that the largest angle between neighboring vectors can not be greater than $\pi$. Hence in the worst-case scenario

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varangle\left(v_{i_{2}^{*}}, v_{\left(i_{2}^{*}+1\right) \bmod k}\right) \geq \frac{2 \pi-\pi}{k-1}=\frac{\pi}{k-1} . \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

This concludes the proof for $d=2$.

Now consider he case where $d>2$. Let $c_{1}, c_{2}$ be a clustering which maximizes the minimum angular distance between any two clients from different clusters. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
i^{*}, j^{*}=\arg \min _{i \in c_{1}, j \in c_{2}} \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $v_{i^{*}}$ and $v_{j^{*}}$ are the two vectors with minimal angular distance. Let $A=\left[v_{i^{*}}, v_{j^{*}}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{d, 2}$ and consider now the projection matrix

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=A\left(A^{T} A\right)^{-1} A^{T} \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

which projects all d-dimensional vectors onto the plane spanned by $v_{i^{*}}$ and $v_{j^{*}}$. Then be linearity of the projection we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=P 0=P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} v_{i}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} P\left(v_{i}\right) \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence the projected vectors also satisfy the condition of the Lemma. As

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varangle\left(P v_{i^{*}}, P v_{j^{*}}\right)=\varangle\left(v_{i^{*}}, v_{j^{*}}\right) \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varangle\left(P v_{i}, P v_{j}\right) \geq \varangle\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right) \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $i, j \notin\left\{i^{*}, j^{*}\right\}$ the clustering $c_{1}, c_{2}$ is still optimal after projecting and we have found a 2 d configuration of vectors satisfying the assumptions of Lemma A1.3 with the same minimal cross-cluster angle. In other words, we have reduced the $d>2$ case to the $d=2$ case, for which we have already proven the result. This concludes the proof.

Theorem A1.4 (Separation Theorem). Let $D_{1}, . ., D_{m}$ be the local training data of $m$ different clients, each dataset sampled from one of $k$ different data generating distributions $\varphi_{1}, . ., \varphi_{k}$, such that $D_{i} \sim \varphi_{I(i)}(x, y)$. Let the empirical risk on every client approximate the true risk at every stationary solution of the Federated Learning objective $\theta^{*}$ s.t.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\nabla R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right\|>\left\|\nabla R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right\| \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

and define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma_{i}:=\frac{\left\|\nabla R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right\|}{\left\|\nabla R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right\|} \in[0,1) \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then there exists a bi-partitioning $c_{1}^{*} \cup c_{2}^{*}=\{1, . ., m\}$ of the client population such that that the maximum similarity between the updates from any two clients from different clusters can be bounded from above according to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_{\text {cross }}^{\max }:=\min _{c_{1} \cup c_{2}=\{1, . . m\}} \max _{i \in c_{1}, j \in c_{2}} \alpha\left(\nabla r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right), \nabla r_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right) \\
& =\max _{i \in c_{1}^{*}, j \in c_{2}^{*}} \alpha\left(\nabla r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right), \nabla r_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \begin{cases}\cos \left(\frac{\pi}{k-1}\right) H_{i, j}+\sin \left(\frac{\pi}{k-1}\right) \sqrt{1-H_{i, j}^{2}} & \text { if } H \geq \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{k-1}\right) \\
1 & \text { else }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$



Fig. A3: Possible configuration in $d=2$. The largest and 2nd largest angle between neighboring vectors (red) separate the two optimal clusters. The largest angle between neighboring vectors is never greater than $\pi$.
with

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{i, j}=-\gamma_{i} \gamma_{j}+\sqrt{1-\gamma_{i}^{2}} \sqrt{1-\gamma_{j}^{2}} \in(-1,1] \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

At the same time the similarity between updates from clients which share the same data generating distribution can be bounded from below by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{i n t r a}^{\min }:=\min _{\substack{i, j \\ I(i)=I(j)}} \alpha\left(\nabla_{\theta} r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right), \nabla_{\theta} r_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right) \geq \min _{\substack{i, j \\ I(i)=I(j)}} H_{i, j} . \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof: For the first result, we know that in every stationary solution of the Federated Learning objective $\theta^{*}$ it holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{l=1}^{k} \gamma_{i} \nabla_{\theta} R_{l}\left(\theta^{*}\right)=0 \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence by Lemma A1.3 there exists a bi-partitioning $\hat{c}_{1} \cup$ $\hat{c}_{2}=\{1, . ., k\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{l \in \hat{c}_{1}, j \in \hat{c}_{2}} \alpha\left(\nabla_{\theta} R_{l}\left(\theta^{*}\right), \nabla_{\theta} R_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)\right) \leq \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{k-1}\right) \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{1}=\left\{i \mid I(i) \in \hat{c}_{1}, i=1, . ., m\right\} \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{2}=\left\{i \mid I(i) \in \hat{c}_{2}, i=1, . ., m\right\} \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

and set for some $i \in c_{1}$ and $j \in c_{2}$ :

$$
\begin{gather*}
v=\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)  \tag{55}\\
X=\nabla_{\theta} r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)  \tag{56}\\
w=\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(j)}\left(\theta^{*}\right) \tag{57}
\end{gather*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y=\nabla_{\theta} r_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(j)}\left(\theta^{*}\right) \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\alpha(v, w) \leq \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{k-1}\right)$ and the result follows directly from Lemma A1.2

The second result follows directly from Lemma A1.1 by setting

$$
\begin{gather*}
v=\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)  \tag{59}\\
X=\nabla_{\theta} r_{i}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right)  \tag{60}\\
Y=\nabla_{\theta} r_{j}\left(\theta^{*}\right)-\nabla_{\theta} R_{I(i)}\left(\theta^{*}\right) \tag{61}
\end{gather*}
$$
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