Fooling neural networks
Last time: Generation of preferred inputs

Last time: Generation of preferred inputs

- Actually, it is easy to generate perceptually incoherent or totally meaningless images that will be classified as any given class with high confidence

A. Nguyen, J. Yosinski, J. Clune, Deep Neural Networks are Easily Fooled: High Confidence Predictions for Unrecognizable Images, CVPR 2015
Adversarial examples

- We can “fool” a neural network by imperceptibly perturbing an input image so it is misclassified.

Source: Stanford CS231n
Adversarial examples: Outline

• Basic definition, analysis of fooling linear classifiers
• Generating adversarial examples
  • Fast gradient sign, iterative variants
  • Universal adversarial perturbations
• Why are neural networks easy to fool?
• Defending against adversarial examples
  • Adversarial training
  • Learning to reject adversarial examples
  • Robust architectures
  • Image pre-processing
• Trends and open questions
  • Broadening the scope of adversarial examples
  • Adversarial examples and human perception
Finding the smallest adversarial perturbation

• Start with correctly classified image $x$
• Find perturbation $r$ minimizing $\|r\|_2$ such that
  • $x + r$ is misclassified (or classified as specific target class)
  • All values of $x + r$ are in the valid range
• This is constrained non-convex optimization, which the authors solve with L-BFGS

Finding the smallest adversarial perturbation

• Sample results:

Gradient ascent

- Rather than searching for the smallest possible perturbation, it is easier to take small gradient steps in desired direction.
- Decrease score (increase loss) of correct class $y^*$:
  $$x \leftarrow x - \eta \frac{\partial f(x,y^*)}{\partial x} \quad \text{or} \quad x \leftarrow x + \eta \frac{\partial L(x,y^*)}{\partial x}$$
- Increase score (decrease loss) of incorrect target class $\hat{y}$:
  $$x \leftarrow x + \eta \frac{\partial f(x,\hat{y})}{\partial x} \quad \text{or} \quad x \leftarrow x - \eta \frac{\partial L(x,\hat{y})}{\partial x}$$
Fooling a linear classifier

• Increase score of target class $\hat{y}$:

$$x \leftarrow x + \eta \frac{\partial f(x, \hat{y})}{\partial x}$$

• For a linear classifier with $f(x, \hat{y}) = \hat{w}^T x$:

$$x \leftarrow x + \eta \hat{w}$$

• To fool a linear classifier, add a small multiple of the target class weights to the test example
Fooling a linear classifier

http://karpathy.github.io/2015/03/30/breaking-convnets/
Analysis of the linear case

• Response of classifier with weights $w$ to adversarial example $x + r$:

$$w^T (x + r) = w^T x + w^T r$$

• Suppose the pixel values have precision $\varepsilon$, i.e., the classifier is normally expected to predict the same class for $x$ and $x + r$ as long as $\|r\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$

• How to choose $r$ to maximize the increase in activation $w^T r$ subject to $\|r\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$?

$$r = \varepsilon \text{ sgn}(w)$$

I. Goodfellow, J. Schloens, C. Szegedy, Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples, ICLR 2015
Analysis of the linear case

- Response of classifier with weights $w$ to adversarial example $x + r$, $r = \epsilon \text{sgn}(w)$:

  \[ w^T(x + r) = w^T x + \epsilon w^T \text{sgn}(w) \]

- If $w$ has dimensionality $d$ and average element magnitude $m$, how much will the activation increase?
  - By $edm$, i.e., linearly as a function of $d$
  - The higher the dimensionality, the easier it is to make many small changes to the input that cause a large change in the output

Toy example

\[
x = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 3 & -2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & -4 & 5 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
w = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
w^T x = -2 + 1 + 3 + 2 + 2 - 2 + 1 - 4 - 5 + 1 = -3
\]

\[
\sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(-3)}} = 0.047
\]
Toy example

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
  & x & 2 & -1 & 3 & -2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & -4 & 5 & 1 \\
  w & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\
  x + r & 1.5 & -1.5 & 3.5 & -2.5 & 2.5 & 1.5 & 1.5 & -3.5 & 4.5 & 1.5 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
w^T x = -2 + 1 + 3 + 2 + 2 - 2 + 1 - 4 - 5 + 1 = -3
\]

\[
\sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(-3)}} = 0.047
\]

\[
w^T (x + r) = -3 + 10 * 0.5 = 2
\]

\[
\sigma(w^T (x + r)) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-2}} = 0.88
\]

http://karpathy.github.io/2015/03/30/breaking-convnets/
Adversarial examples: Outline

• Basic definition, analysis of fooling linear classifiers
• Generating adversarial examples
  • Fast gradient sign, iterative variants
  • Universal adversarial perturbations
Generating adversarial examples

- **Fast gradient sign method:** Find the gradient of the loss w.r.t. correct class $y^*$, take element-wise sign, update in resulting direction:

  $$x \leftarrow x + \epsilon \text{sgn} \left( \frac{\partial L(x, y^*)}{\partial x} \right)$$

Generating adversarial examples

• **Fast gradient sign method:**
  
  \[ \mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} + \epsilon \text{sgn}\left( \frac{\partial L(x, y^*)}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \]

• **Iterative gradient sign method:** take multiple smaller steps until misclassified, each time clip result to be within \( \epsilon \)-neighborhood of original image

• **Least likely class method:** try to misclassify image as class \( \hat{y} \) with *smallest* initial score:
  
  \[ \mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} - \epsilon \text{sgn}\left( \frac{\partial L(x, \hat{y})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \]

---

Generating adversarial examples

Comparison of methods for $\epsilon = 32$

Generating adversarial examples

Figure 2: Top-1 and top-5 accuracy of Inception v3 under attack by different adversarial methods and different $\epsilon$ compared to “clean images” — unmodified images from the dataset. The accuracy was computed on all 50,000 validation images from the ImageNet dataset. In these experiments $\epsilon$ varies from 2 to 128.

A. Kurakin, I. Goodfellow, S. Bengio, Adversarial examples in the real world, ICLR 2017 workshop
Printed adversarial examples

- “Black box” attack on a cell phone app: take a clean image, add perturbation, print out, classify with TensorFlow Camera Demo app

Printed adversarial examples

- Accuracies for printed vs. digital images:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adversarial method</th>
<th>Photos</th>
<th>Source images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean images</td>
<td>Adv. images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast $\epsilon = 16$</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast $\epsilon = 8$</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast $\epsilon = 4$</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast $\epsilon = 2$</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter. basic $\epsilon = 16$</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter. basic $\epsilon = 8$</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter. basic $\epsilon = 4$</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter. basic $\epsilon = 2$</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.l. class $\epsilon = 16$</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.l. class $\epsilon = 8$</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.l. class $\epsilon = 4$</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.l. class $\epsilon = 2$</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universal adversarial perturbations

- Goal: for a given network, find an *image-independent* perturbation vector that causes *all images* to be misclassified with high probability

Universal adversarial perturbations

**Approach:**

- Start with \( r = 0 \)
- Cycle through training examples \( x_i \) (in multiple passes)
  - If \( x_i + r \) is misclassified, skip to \( x_{i+1} \)
  - Find minimum perturbation \( \Delta r \) that takes \( x_i + r + \Delta r \) to another class
  - Update \( r \leftarrow r + \Delta r \), enforce \( ||r|| \leq \epsilon \)
- Terminate when fooling rate on training examples reaches target value

Universal adversarial perturbations

- Perturbation vectors computed from different architectures:

Universal adversarial perturbations

Fooling ratio on validation set vs. training set (X) size for GoogLeNet

Fooling rates on different models after training on 10,000 images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\ell_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val.</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell_\infty$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val.</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universal adversarial perturbations

- Universal perturbations turn out to generalize well across models!

Fooling rate when computing a perturbation for one model (rows) and testing it on others (columns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VGG-F</th>
<th>CaffeNet</th>
<th>GoogLeNet</th>
<th>VGG-16</th>
<th>VGG-19</th>
<th>ResNet-152</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VGG-F</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaffeNet</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoogLeNet</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG-16</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGG-19</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet-152</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adversarial examples: Outline

• Basic definition, analysis of fooling linear classifiers
• Generating adversarial examples
  • Fast gradient sign, iterative variants
  • Universal adversarial perturbations
• Why are neural networks easy to fool?
Properties of adversarial examples: Summary

• For any input image, it is usually easy to generate a very similar image that gets misclassified by the same network
• To obtain an adversarial example, one does not need to do precise gradient ascent
• Adversarial images can (somewhat) survive transformations like being printed and photographed
• It is possible to attack many images with the same perturbation
• Adversarial examples that can fool one network have a high chance of fooling a network with different parameters and even architecture
Why are deep networks easy to fool?

• Networks are “too linear”: it is easy to manipulate output in a predictable way given the input
• The input dimensionality is high, so one can get a large change in the output by changing individual inputs by small amounts
• Neural networks can fit anything, but nothing prevents them from behaving erratically between training samples
  • Counter-intuitively, a network can both generalize well on natural images and be susceptible to adversarial examples
• Adversarial examples generalize well because different models learn similar functions when trained to perform the same task (or because adversarial examples are a function of the data rather than of the network)?
Adversarial examples are not bugs, but features?

Disentangle features into robust and non-robust

Construct a dataset which appears mislabeled to humans (via adversarial examples) but results in good accuracy on the original test set

A. Ilyas et al. Adversarial Examples are not Bugs, they are Features. NeurIPS 2019
Adversarial examples: Outline
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Defending against adversarial examples

• Adversarial training: networks can be made somewhat resistant by augmenting or regularizing training with adversarial examples (Goodfellow et al. 2015, Tramer et al. 2018)
Defending against adversarial examples

- Adversarial training: networks can be made somewhat resistant by augmenting or regularizing training with adversarial examples (Goodfellow et al. 2015, Tramer et al. 2018)
- Adversarial objectives can also be formulated (Madry et al., 2018)

Figure 3: A conceptual illustration of standard vs. adversarial decision boundaries. Left: A set of points that can be easily separated with a simple (in this case, linear) decision boundary. Middle: The simple decision boundary does not separate the $\ell_\infty$-balls (here, squares) around the data points. Hence there are adversarial examples (the red stars) that will be misclassified. Right: Separating the $\ell_\infty$-balls requires a significantly more complicated decision boundary. The resulting classifier is robust to adversarial examples with bounded $\ell_\infty$-norm perturbations.
Defending against adversarial examples

- Adversarial training: networks can be made somewhat resistant by augmenting or regularizing training with adversarial examples (Goodfellow et al. 2015, Tramer et al. 2018)
- Adversarial objectives can also be formulated (Madry et al., 2018)
  - There is even evidence that such models may give better performance when transferred to different tasks (Salman et al., 2020)
Defending against adversarial examples

- Train a separate model to reject adversarial examples: SafetyNet

J. Lu, T. Issaranon, D. Forsyth, SafetyNet: Detecting and Rejecting Adversarial Examples Robustly, CVPR 2017
Defending against adversarial examples

• Robust architectures

C. Xie et al., Feature Denoising for Improving Adversarial Robustness, CVPR 2018
Defending against adversarial examples

- Pre-process input images to disrupt adversarial perturbations

C. Guo, M. Rana, M. Cisse, L. van der Maaten, *Countering Adversarial Images Using Input Transformations*, ICLR 2018
Adversarial examples: Outline
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Adversarial examples for detection

- TL;DR: It is much harder to fool a detector like Faster R-CNN or YOLO than a classifier; larger perturbations are required

J. Lu, H. Sibai, E. Fabry, *Adversarial examples that fool detectors*, arXiv 2018
Adversarial examples for detection

- TL;DR: It is much harder to fool a detector like Faster R-CNN or YOLO than a classifier; larger perturbations are required

J. Lu, H. Sibai, E. Fabry, *Adversarial examples that fool detectors*, arXiv 2018
Adversarial examples for detection

- TL;DR: It is much harder to fool a detector like Faster R-CNN or YOLO than a classifier; larger perturbations are required
- It is even harder to fool a detector with physical objects

"All three patterns reliably fool detectors when mapped into videos. However, physical instances of these patterns are not equally successful. The first two stop signs, as physical objects, only occasionally fool Faster RCNN; the third one, which has a much more extreme pattern, is more effective."

J. Lu, H. Sibai, E. Fabry, *Adversarial examples that fool detectors*, arXiv 2018
Adversarial examples for detection

- TL;DR: It is much harder to fool a detector like Faster R-CNN or YOLO than a classifier; larger perturbations are required
- It is even harder to fool a detector with physical objects

J. Lu, H. Sibai, E. Fabry, Adversarial examples that fool detectors, arXiv 2018
Adversarial examples for detection

• TL;DR: It is much harder to fool a detector like Faster R-CNN or YOLO than a classifier; larger perturbations are required
• It is even harder to fool a detector with physical objects

J. Lu, H. Sibai, E. Fabry, *Adversarial examples that fool detectors*, arXiv 2018
Adversarial examples for 3D transformations

3D printed adversarial object (YouTube video)

[Images of 3D printed objects with classification labels]

https://blog.openai.com/robust-adversarial-inputs/

A. Athalye, L. Engstrom, A. Ilyas, K. Kwok, Synthesizing Robust Adversarial Examples, ICML 2018
Adversarial examples beyond the infinity-norm constraint

A. Bhattad, M.-J. Chong, K. Liang, B. Li, D. Forsyth. **Unrestricted adversarial examples via semantic manipulation.** ICLR 2020
Adversarial examples and humans
Adversarial examples and humans

- Adversarial examples that are designed to transfer across multiple architectures can also be shown to confuse the human visual system in rapid presentation settings

G. Elsayed et al., *Adversarial Examples that Fool both Computer Vision and Time-Limited Humans*, NeurIPS 2018
How robust is biological perception, really?

http://www.stuartmcmillen.com/comic/supernormal-stimuli/
Recall: Generation of preferred inputs

A. Nguyen, J. Yosinski, J. Clune, Deep Neural Networks are Easily Fooled: High Confidence Predictions for Unrecognizable Images, CVPR 2015
Supernormal stimuli for humans?

For further reading