

Online Adversarial Attacks

Andjela Mladenovic*
Université de Montréal,
Mila

Avishek Joey Bose*
McGill University, Mila

Hugo Berard*
Université de Montréal, Mila,
Facebook AI Research

William L. Hamilton†
McGill University, Mila

Simon Lacoste-Julien†
Université de Montréal,
Mila

Pascal Vincent†
Facebook AI Research,
Université de Montréal, Mila

Gauthier Gidel†
Université de Montréal,
Mila

Abstract

Adversarial attacks expose important vulnerabilities of deep learning models, yet little attention has been paid to settings where data arrives as a stream. In this paper, we formalize the online adversarial attack problem, emphasizing two key elements found in real-world use-cases: attackers must operate under partial knowledge of the target model, and the decisions made by the attacker are irrevocable since they operate on a transient data stream. We first rigorously analyze a deterministic variant of the online threat model by drawing parallels to the well-studied *k*-secretary problem and propose VIRTUAL+, a simple yet practical algorithm yielding a provably better competitive ratio for $k = 2$ over the current best single threshold algorithm. We also introduce the *stochastic k*-secretary—effectively reducing online blackbox attacks to a *k*-secretary problem under noise—and prove theoretical bounds on the competitive ratios of *any* online algorithms adapted to this setting. Finally, we complement our theoretical results by conducting a systematic suite of experiments on MNIST and CIFAR-10 with both vanilla and robust classifiers, revealing that, by leveraging online secretary algorithms, like VIRTUAL+, we can get an online attack success rate close to the one achieved by the optimal offline solution.

1 Introduction




Figure 1: Man-in-the-Middle Attack.

In adversarial attacks, an attacker seeks to maliciously disrupt the performance of deep learning systems by adding small but often imperceptible noise to otherwise clean data [Szegedy et al., 2014, Goodfellow et al., 2015]. Critical to the study of adversarial attacks is specifying the threat model Akhtar and Mian [2018], which outlines the adversarial capabilities of an attacker and the level of information available in crafting attacks. Canonical examples include the *whitebox* threat model Madry et al. [2017], where the attacker has complete access, and the less permissive *blackbox* threat model where an attacker only has partial information, like the ability to query the target model [Chen et al., 2017, Ilyas et al., 2019, Papernot et al., 2016].

Previously studied threat models (e.g., whitebox and blackbox) implicitly assume a static setting with full access to a target dataset [Tramèr et al., 2018]. However, such an assumption is unrealistic in many real-world systems. Countless real-world applications involve streaming data that arrive in an online fashion (e.g., financial markets or real-time sensor networks). Understanding the feasibility of adversarial attacks in this *online* setting is an essential question.

As a motivating example, consider the case where the adversary launches a man-in-the-middle attack depicted in Fig. 1. Here, data is streamed between two endpoints—i.e., from sensors on an autonomous car to the actual autonomous control system. An adversary, in this example, would intercept the streaming sensor data, potentially perturb it, and then send the corrupted data to the controller. Unlike classical adversarial attacks, such a scenario presents two key challenges that are representative of all online settings.

1. **Transiency:** At every time step, the attacker must make an irrevocable decision on whether to attack the given datapoint. If the attacker fails, or opts not to attack, then that datapoint is no longer available for further attacks.
2. **Online Attack Budget:** The adversary—to remain anonymous—is restricted to a small selection budget and must optimally balance a passive exploration phase before selecting items in the data stream to attack.

To the best of our knowledge, the only existing approaches that craft adversarial examples on streaming data [Gong et al., 2019a, Lin et al., 2017, Sun et al., 2020] require multiple passes through a data stream and thus cannot be applied in a realistic online setting where an adversary is forced into irrevocable decisions. Moreover, these approaches do not come with theoretical guarantees. Consequently, assessing the practicality of adversarial attacks—to better expose risks—in a truly online setting is still an open problem, and the central focus of this paper. Our main contributions are the proposal of a new *online threat model* capturing the challenges of the online setting as well as providing a *theoretical framework* (§4) and a *practical algorithm* (Alg. 2) to ground the study of online adversarial attacks.

Main Contributions. We formalize an online threat model to study adversarial attacks on streaming data. In our online threat model, the adversary must execute k successful attacks within n streamed data points, where $k \ll n$. As a starting point for our analysis, we study the deterministic online threat model in which the actual value of an input—i.e., the likelihood of a successful attack—is revealed along with the input. Our first insight elucidates that such a threat model, modulo the attack strategy, equates to the k -secretary problem known in the field of optimal stopping theory Dynkin [1963], Kleinberg [2005], allowing for the application of established online algorithms for picking optimal data points to attack. We then propose a novel online algorithm VIRTUAL+ that is simple to implement for any pair (k, n) and requires no additional hyperparameters, making it a natural choice for online adversarial attacks.

Besides, motivated by attacking blackbox target models, we also introduce a modified secretary problem dubbed the *stochastic k -secretary problem*, which assumes the values an attacker observes are stochastic estimates of the actual value. We prove theoretical bounds on the competitive ratio for *any* classical online algorithms in this setting. Guided by our theoretical results, we conduct experiments on both toy and standard datasets and classifiers (i.e., MNIST and CIFAR-10). We empirically show that even simple attack strategies can achieve high attack transfer rates when paired with an online algorithm, demonstrating the importance of carefully selecting which data points to attack.

Our key contributions are summarized as follows:

- We formalize the online adversarial attack threat model as an online decision problem and rigorously connect it to a generalization of the k -secretary problem.
- We introduce an online algorithm VIRTUAL+ for the k -secretary problem and prove that it achieves a competitive ratio greater than 0.42737 for $k = 2$, outperforming the previous best single threshold algorithm SINGLE-REF Albers and Ladewig [2020].
- We propose Alg. 2 that leverages (secretary) online algorithms to perform efficient online adversarial attacks. We compare different online algorithms including VIRTUAL+ via experiments on MNIST and CIFAR-10.

2 Background and Preliminaries

We first briefly review the classical adversarial attack setup and the k -secretary problem that serve as foundations for the online threat model outlined later in §3.

2.1 Classical Adversarial Attack Setup

We are interested in constructing adversarial examples against some fixed target classifier $f_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ which consumes input data points $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and labels them with a class label $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The goal of an adversarial attack is then to produce an adversarial example $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, such that $f_t(x') \neq y$, and where the distance $d(x, x') \leq \gamma$. Then, equipped with a loss function ℓ used to evaluate f_t , an adversarial attack is said to be optimal if [Carlini and Wagner, 2017, Madry et al., 2017],

$$x' \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \ell(f_t(x'), y), \text{ s.t. } d(x, x') \leq \gamma. \quad (1)$$

Note that the formulation above makes no assumptions about access and resource restrictions imposed upon the adversary. Indeed, if f_t and its parameters are readily available, we arrive at the familiar whitebox setting, and the optimization problem may be solved

by computing and following the gradient $\nabla_x f_t$ that maximizes ℓ .

2.2 k -Secretary Problem

The secretary problem is a well-known problem in theoretical computer science Dynkin [1963], Ferguson et al. [1989]. Suppose that we are tasked with hiring a secretary from a randomly ordered set of n potential candidates to select the secretary with maximum value. The secretaries are interviewed sequentially and reveal their actual value on arrival. Thus, the decision to accept or reject a secretary must be made immediately, irrevocably, and without knowledge of future candidates. While there exist many generalizations of this problem, in this work, we consider one of the most canonical generalizations known as the k -secretary problem Kleinberg [2005]. Here, instead of choosing the best secretary, we are tasked with choosing k candidates to maximize the expected sum of values. Typically, online algorithms that attempt to solve secretary problems are evaluated using the competitive ratio, which is the value of the objective achieved by an online algorithm compared to an optimal value of the objective that is achieved by an ideal “offline algorithm,” i.e., an algorithm with access to the entire candidate set. Formally, an online algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that selects a subset of items $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ is said to be C_n -competitive to the optimal algorithm OPT which greedily selects a subset of items S^* while having full knowledge of all n items, if

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{S}_n}[\mathbb{V}(S_{\mathcal{A}})] \geq C_n \mathbb{V}(S^*), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{V}$ is a set-value function that determines the sum utility of each algorithm’s selection, and the expectations are over permutations sampled from the symmetric group of n elements, $\mathcal{S}_n$, acting on the data stream. Moreover, $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be asymptotically C -competitive, if for $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{S}_n}[\mathbb{V}(S_{\mathcal{A}})] \geq (C + o(1))\mathbb{V}(S^*).$$

In §4, we shall further generalize the k -secretary problem to its stochastic variant—along with an accompanying definition of a stochastic competitive ratio—where the online algorithm is no longer privy to the actual values but must instead choose under uncertainty.

3 Online Adversarial Attacks

Motivated by our more realistic threat model, we now consider a novel adversarial attack problem where the data is no longer static but arrives in an online fashion.

3.1 Adversarial Attacks as Secretary Problems

The defining feature of the online threat model—in addition to streaming data and the fact that we may not have access to the target model f_t —is the online attack budget constraint. Choosing when to attack under a fixed budget in the online setting can be related to a secretary problem. We formalize this online adversarial attack problem in the online threat model below.

Online Threat Model. *The online threat model relies on the following key definitions:*

- **The target model f_t .** *The adversarial goal is to attack some target model $f_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, through adversarial examples that respect a chosen distance function with tolerance γ —i.e. $d(x, x') \leq \gamma$*
- **The data stream $\mathcal{D}$.** *The data stream $\mathcal{D}$ contains the n examples (x_i, y_i) ordered by their time of arrival, that attacker seeks to corrupt. At any timestep i , the adversary receives the corresponding item in $\mathcal{D}$ and must decide whether to execute an attack or forever forego the chance to attack this item.*
- **Online attack budget k .** *The adversary is limited to a maximum of k attempts to craft adversarial examples within the online setting thus imposing that each attack is on a unique item in $\mathcal{D}$.*
- **A value function $\mathcal{V}$.** *Each item in the dataset is assigned a value on arrival by the value function $\mathcal{V} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which represents the utility of selecting the item to craft an attack. This can be the likelihood of a successful attack under f_t (true value) or a stochastic estimate of the incurred loss given by a surrogate model $f_s \approx f_t$.*

The online threat model corresponds to the setting where the adversary seeks to craft adversarial attacks (i) against a target model $f_t \in \mathcal{F}$, (ii) by observing items in $\mathcal{D}$ that arrive online, (iii) and choosing k optimal items to attack by relying on (iv) an available value function $\mathcal{V}$. The adversary’s objective is then to use its value function towards selecting items in $\mathcal{D}$ that maximize the sum total value of selections $\mathbb{V}$ (Eq. 3).

In the online threat model we are given a data stream $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$ of n samples ordered by their time of arrival. In order to craft an attack against the target model f_t , the adversary selects, using its online algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, a subset $S_{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{D}$ of items to

maximize:

$$\mathbb{V}(S_A) := \sum_{(x,y) \in S_A} \ell(f_t(\text{ATT}(x)), y) \quad \text{s.t. } |S_A| \leq k, \quad (3)$$

where $\text{ATT}(x)$ denotes an attack on x crafted by a *fixed* attack method ATT that might or might not depend on f_t . From now on we define $x'_i = \text{ATT}(x_i)$. Intuitively, the adversary chooses k instances that are the “easiest” to attack, i.e. samples that result in the highest value.

Note that selecting an instance to attack does not guarantee a successful attack. Indeed, a successful attack vector may not exist if the perturbation budget γ is too small even though the value is maximized. However, stating the adversarial goal as maximizing the value of S_A leads to the measurable objective of calculating the ratio of successful attack vectors in S_A versus S^* .

If the adversary knows the true value of a datapoint then the online attack problem reduces to the original k -secretary. On the other hand, the adversary might not have access to f_t and instead, the adversary’s value function may be an estimate of the true value—e.g. the loss of a surrogate classifier, and the adversary must make selection decisions in the face of uncertainty, yielding a stochastic generalization of the k -secretary problem. The theory developed in this paper will tackle both the case where values $v_i := \ell(f_t(x'_i), y_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} := [n]$ are known (§3.2), as well as the richer stochastic with only estimates of v_i , $i \in [n]$ (§4).

3.2 Virtual+ for Adversarial Secretary Problems

Let us first consider the deterministic variant of the online threat model, where the true value is known on arrival. For example consider the value function $\mathcal{V}(x_i, y_i) = \ell(f_t(x'_i), y_i) = v_i$ i.e. the loss resulting from the adversary corrupting incoming data x_i into x'_i . Under a fixed attack strategy, the selection of high-value items from $\mathcal{D}$ is exactly the original k -secretary problem and thus the adversary may employ any $\mathcal{A}$ that solves the original k -secretary problem. Well known single threshold-based algorithms that solve the k -secretary problem include the VIRTUAL, OPTIMISTIC Babaioff et al. [2007] and the recent SINGLE-REF algorithm Albers et al. [2019]. In a nutshell, these online algorithm consists of two phases—a *sampling phase* followed by a *selection phase*—and an optimal stopping point t (threshold) that is used by the algorithm to transition between the phases. In the sampling phase, the algorithms passively observe all data points up to a pre-specified threshold t . Note that t itself is algorithm-specific and can be chosen by solving a separate optimization problem. Additionally, each algorithm also

Algorithm 1 VIRTUAL and VIRTUAL+

Inputs: $t \in [k \dots n - k]$, $R = \emptyset$, $S_A = \emptyset$

Sampling phase: Observe the first t data points and construct a sorted list R with the indices of the top k data points seen. The method `sort` ensures: $\mathcal{V}(R[1]) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[2]) \dots \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$.

Selection phase: ~~//VIRT+ removes L2-3 and adds a condition L4~~

```

1: for  $i := t + 1$  to  $n$  do
2:   if  $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$  and  $R[k] > t$  then
3:      $R = \text{sort}(R \cup \{i\} \setminus \{R[k]\})$ 
4:   else if  $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$  and  $|S_A| \leq k$  then
5:      $R = \text{sort}(R \cup \{i\} \setminus \{R[k]\})$     // Update  $R$ 
6:      $S_A = S_A \cup \{i\}$                   // Select element  $i$ 
```

maintains a sorted reference list R containing the top- k elements. Each algorithm then executes the selection phase through comparisons of incoming items to those in R and possibly updating R itself in the process (see §C).

Indeed, the simple structure of both the VIRTUAL and OPTIMISTIC algorithms—e.g., a having few hyperparameters and not requiring the algorithm to involve linear programs for varying values of n and k —in addition to being $(1/e)$ -competitive (optimal for $k = 1$) make them suitable candidates for solving Eq. 3. However, the competitive ratio of both algorithms in the small k regime—but not $k = 1$ —has shown to be sub-optimal with SINGLE-REF provably yielding larger competitive ratios at the cost of an additional hyperparameters (the reference element in R and t) selected via combinatorial optimization when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We now present a novel online algorithm VIRTUAL+ that retains the simple structure of VIRTUAL and OPTIMISTIC, with no extra hyperparameters, but which we prove leads for $k = 2$ to a competitive ratio greater than 0.42737, outperforming SINGLE-REF that achieves $C = 0.4119$. Our key insight is derived from re-examining the selection condition in the VIRTUAL algorithm and noticing that it is overly conservative and can be simplified. The VIRTUAL+ algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1, where the removed condition in VIRTUAL (L2-3) is ~~in pink strikethrough~~. Concretely, the condition that is used by VIRTUAL but *not* by VIRTUAL+ updates R during the selection phase without actually picking the item as part of the algorithm’s selection set S_A . Essentially, this condition is theoretically convenient and leads to a simpler analysis by ensuring that the VIRTUAL algorithm never exceeds k selections in S_A . VIRTUAL+ removes this conservative R update criteria in favor of a simple to implement condition, $|S_A| \leq k$ line 4 (in pink) for any k and n . Furthermore, by modifying the selection rule, it also retains the simplicity of VIRTUAL leading to a painless application to online attack problems.

Competitive ratio of Virtual+. What appears to

be a minor modification in VIRTUAL+ compared to VIRTUAL leads to a significantly more involved analysis but a larger competitive ratio. In Theorem 1, we see that VIRTUAL+ provably improves in competitive ratio for $k = 2$ over both VIRTUAL, OPTIMISTIC, and in particular the previous best single threshold algorithm, SINGLE-REF.

Theorem 1. *For $k = 2$, if we set $t = \alpha \cdot n$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the competitive ratio achieved by VIRTUAL+ follows,*

$$C_n \geq \alpha(3(1 - \alpha) + 2\alpha \ln(\alpha)) + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \quad (4)$$

Thus, asymptotically we have

$$C \geq \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \alpha(3(1 - \alpha) + 2\alpha \ln(\alpha)) > .4273 > 1/e. \quad (5)$$

Proof sketch. The full proof can be found in §A. First note that by [Albers and Ladewig, 2020, Lem. 3.3], we have a competitive ratio for the k -secretary problem under any threshold-based algorithm that is equal to

$$C_n = \frac{1}{k} (\mathbb{P}(i_1 \in S_A) + \dots + \mathbb{P}(i_k \in S_A)) \quad (6)$$

where i_a is the index of the a^{th} best secretary. Now, let us focus on the case $k = 2$. When calculating the probability of one of the top-2 elements being picked by the algorithm, we must calculate the probability of one of the top-2 elements being picked after the threshold —i.e., for a given time step $j + 1$ between $t + 1 \dots n$. A top-2 element is picked by VIRTUAL+ if and only if this element appears at that time step and if we haven't already picked 2 secretaries ($|S_A| < 2$) during the first j steps. Thus, for $a \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(i_a \in S_A) = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbb{P}_t(|S_A| < 2) + \dots + \mathbb{P}_{n-1}(|S_A| < 2))$$

where $\mathbb{P}_j(E) := \mathbb{P}(E \text{ in first } j \text{ steps})$ for any event E . Now, for a given j , we compute $\mathbb{P}_j(|S_A| < 2)$ by decomposing the event into the probability of having an empty S_A plus the probability of having $|S_A| = 1$. The computation of the latter is detailed in §A and summarized in Fig. 5.

$$\mathbb{P}_j(|S_A| = 0) = \frac{t(t-1)}{j(j-1)}, \quad \mathbb{P}_j(|S_A| = 1) = \frac{2t}{j(j-1)} \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{t-1}{p-2}$$

Overall, by combining the previous equations we get:

$$C_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{t(t-1)}{j(j-1)} + 2 \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{1}{j} \frac{t}{j-1} \frac{t-1}{p-2} \right) \quad (7)$$

Finally, by lower bounding the sums with integrals we get,

$$C_n \geq \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \left(\frac{3}{t} - \frac{2 \ln(n/t) + 3}{n} - 2(n-t) \left| \frac{16}{3t^3 e^4} \right| \right)$$




Figure 2: Each online algorithm, $\mathcal{A}$, observes estimates of v_i and maintains a reference list R during the sampling phase. Items are then picked into S_A , after threshold t , via comparisons to R .

Now, for $t = \alpha n$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, that lower-bound becomes

$$C \geq \alpha(3 - \alpha(3 - 2 \ln(\alpha))) + \mathcal{O}(1/n), \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, 1) \quad (8)$$

The constant term of the RHS is a concave function of α that is maximized for $\alpha^* \approx 0.38240$. Thus, our algorithm achieves a competitive ratio larger than 0.42737. $\square$

Connection to Prior Work. VIRTUAL+ achieves a competitive ratio that pushes the state-of-the-art in terms of practical k -secretary algorithms. However, it is also important to contextualize VIRTUAL+ against recent theoretical advances in this space. Most prominently, Buchbinder et al. [2014] and Chan et al. [2014] proved that the k -secretary problem can be solved *optimally* (in terms of competitive ratio) using linear programs (LPs), *assuming a fixed length of n for the data stream*. These results prove the existence of theoretically optimal algorithms, but they are typically not feasible in practice. For example, they require individually tuning multiple thresholds by solving a separate LP with $\Omega(nk^2)$ parameters for each length of the data stream n , and the number of constraints grows to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In this work, we chose to focus on practical methods with a *single* threshold (e.g. Algorithm 1) that do not require involved computations that grow with n .

4 Stochastic Secretary Problem

In practice, online adversaries are unlikely to have access to the target model f_t . Instead, it is reasonable to assume that they have partial knowledge. Following Papernot et al. [2017], Bose et al. [2020] we focus on modeling that partial knowledge by equipping the adversary with a surrogate model or representative classifier f_s . Using f_s as opposed to f_t means that we

can compute the value $\mathcal{V}_i := \ell(f_s(x'_i), y_i)$ of an incoming data point. This value $\mathcal{V}_i$ acts as an estimate of the value of interest $v_i := \ell(f_t(x'_i), y_i)$. The *stochastic k -secretary problem* is then to pick, under the noise model induced by using f_s , the optimal subset $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ of size k from $\mathcal{D}$. Thus, with no further assumptions on f_s it is unclear whether online algorithms, as previously defined in section 3.2, are still serviceable under uncertainty.

Sources of randomness. Our method relies on the idea that we can use the surrogate model f_s to estimate the value of some adversarial examples on the target model f_t . We justify here how partial knowledge on f_t could provide us an estimate of v_i . For example, we may know the general architecture and training procedure of f_t , but there will be inherent randomness in the optimization (e.g., due to initialization or data sampling), making it impossible to perfectly replicate f_t . Consequently, we can view the training of a surrogate model f_s —using the same general training procedure—as a sample from a common (for f_s and f_t) underlying distribution $\mathcal{T}$. In that context, it seems reasonable to assume that the random variable $\mathcal{V}_i := \ell(f_s(x'_i), y_i)$ is likely to be close to $v_i := \ell(f_t(x'_i), y_i)$. We formalize this assumption on the random variable $\mathcal{V}_i$ in Eq. 9 below.

4.1 Stochastic Secretary Algorithms

To ground our study of online adversarial attacks in this challenging setting, we now define the stochastic k -secretary problem. In this setting, we assume to have access to the random variables $\mathcal{V}_i$ and that v_i are fixed for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and the goal is to maximize a notion of stochastic competitive ratio. This notion is similar to the standard competitive ratio defined in Eq. 2 with the small difference that in the stochastic case, the algorithm does not have access to the values v_i but to a random variable (R.V.) $\mathcal{V}_i$ that is an estimate of v_i . An algorithm is said to be C -competitive in the stochastic setting if asymptotically in n ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{S}_n}[\mathbb{V}(S_{\mathcal{A}})] \geq (C + \mathcal{O}(1))\mathbb{V}(S^*).$$

Here the expectation is taken over $\mathcal{S}_n$ (uniformly random permutations of the datastream $\mathcal{D}$ of size n) and over the randomness of $\mathcal{V}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ and S^* are the set of items chosen by the stochastic online and offline algorithms respectively (note that while the online algorithm has access to $\mathcal{V}_i$, the offline algorithm picks the best v_i) and $\mathbb{V}$ is a set-value function that determines the sum utility of each algorithms selection. Fig. 2 illustrates the execution of threshold based online algorithms in the stochastic setting.

Analysis of the algorithms. In the stochastic setting all online algorithms observe $\mathcal{V}_i$ that is an estimate

of the actual value v_i defined as $\mathcal{V}_i = v_i + \epsilon_i$. That is, we assume that the distribution of $\mathcal{V}_i$ has non-vanishing mass around v_i . More formally, we assume that there exists $\sigma > 0$ s.t.,

$$\mathbb{P}[|\mathcal{V}_i - v_i| \geq \sqrt{2}\sigma\epsilon] \leq e^{-\epsilon^2}, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0, \forall i \in [n]. \quad (9)$$

Such an assumption is quite mild since it holds, for instance, for any sub-Gaussian distribution that admits a continuous and non-vanishing density around v_i .¹ The second quantity of interest is the minimal gap between the actual values v_i :

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2} \min_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \{|v_i - v_j|\} \quad (10)$$

We can now show that the competitive ratio of any online algorithm in the stochastic setting is the same as the deterministic setting up to a multiplicative factor.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C_n -competitive secretary algorithm. When having access to random variables $\mathcal{V}_i$, $i \in [n]$ satisfying Eq. 9, $\mathcal{A}$ has a stochastic competitive ratio of at least:*

$$C_n(1 - e^{-\frac{\Delta^2}{2\sigma^2}})^n \quad (11)$$

The proof of Thm. 2 can be found in §B. Such a theoretical result is quite interesting as the stochastic setting initially appears significantly more challenging due to the non-zero probability that the observed ordering of historical values, $\mathcal{V}_i$, not being faithful to the true ordering based on v_i . However, Thm. 2 explains that any C_n -competitive algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ in the deterministic setting is at least as feasible up to a multiplicative factor in the stochastic setting. In fact, as we demonstrate in §B, this multiplicative factor is precisely the probability that the true ordering based on v_i is preserved under the assumption described in Eq. 9.

4.2 Results on Synthetic Data

We assess the performance of classical single threshold online algorithms and VIRTUAL+ in solving the stochastic k -secretary problem on a synthetic dataset of size $n = 100$ with $k \in [1, 10]$. The value of a data point is its index in $\mathcal{D}$ prior to applying any permutation $\pi \sim \mathcal{S}_n$ plus noise $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. We compute the competitive ratio over $10k$ unique permutations and plot the mean result of each algorithm in Figure 3. As illustrated for $k = 1$ all algorithms roughly achieve the optimal $(1/e)$ -deterministic competitive ratio in the stochastic setting. Note that the noise level, σ^2 , appears to have a small impact on the performance of

¹We considered the same σ for all $\mathcal{V}_i$ but a tighter bound is possible by considering a different σ_i for each random variable.




Figure 3: Estimation of the competitive ratio of online algorithms in the stochastic k -secretary problem with $\sigma^2 = 10$.

the algorithms (§D.1). This substantiates our result in Thm. 2 indicating that C_n -competitive algorithms only degrade by a small factor in the stochastic setting. For $k = 2$, VIRTUAL+ achieves the best competitive ratio validating our main result in Thm 1. VIRTUAL+ continues to perform favorably for small values $k < 5$ after which SINGLE-REF is superior. This was expected as we note that the hyperparameters in SINGLE-REF—e.g. t and reference rank—are tuned offline for each value of k by solving a separate combinatorial optimization problem while in VIRTUAL+ we use the optimal t for $k = 2$ found in Eq. 8. We hypothesize that finding optimal thresholds for $k > 2$ will further aid the performance of VIRTUAL+ but leave this as future work.

5 Experiments

We investigate the feasibility of online adversarial attacks by considering an online version of the challenging NoBox setting [Bose et al., 2020] in which the adversary must generate attacks without any access, including queries, to the target model f_t . Instead, the adversary only has access to a surrogate f_s which is similar to f_t . In particular, we pick at random a f_t and f_s from an ensemble of pre-trained models from various canonical architectures. We perform experiments on the MNIST LeCun and Cortes [2010] and CIFAR-10 Krizhevsky [2009] datasets where we simulate a $\mathcal{D}$ by generating 1000 permutations of the test set and feeding each instantiation to Alg. 2. In practice, online adversaries compute the value $\mathcal{V}_i = \ell(f_s(x'_i), y_i)$ of each data point in $\mathcal{D}$ by attacking f_s using their fixed attack strategy (where ℓ is the cross-entropy), but the decision to submit the attack to f_t is done using an online algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ (see Alg. 2). As representative attack strategies, we use the well-known FGSM attack [Goodfellow et al., 2015] and a universal whitebox attack in PGD [Madry et al., 2017]. We are most interested in evaluating the online fool rate, which is simply the ratio of successfully executed attacks against f_t out of a possible of k attacks selected by $\mathcal{A}$. Attacks are conducted with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm with a perturbation budget

Algorithm 2 Online Adversarial Attack

Inputs: Permuted Datastream: $\mathcal{D}_\pi$, Online Algorithm: $\mathcal{A}$, Surrogate classifier: f_s , Target classifier: f_t , Attack method: ATT, Loss: ℓ , Budget: k , Fool rate: $F_\pi^{\mathcal{A}} = 0$.

```

1: for  $(x_i, y_i)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_\pi$  do
2:    $x'_i \leftarrow \text{ATT}(x_i)$  { // Compute the attack }
3:    $\mathcal{V}_i \leftarrow \ell(f_s(x'_i), y_i)$  { // Compute the estimate of  $v_i$  }
4:   if  $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_i, k) == \text{TRUE}$  then
5:      $F_\pi^{\mathcal{A}} \leftarrow F_\pi^{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{1_{\{f_t(x'_i) \neq y_i\}}}{k}$  { // Submit  $x'_i$  on  $f_t$  }
6: return:  $F_\pi^{\mathcal{A}}$  { // Note that  $\mathcal{A}$  always submits  $k$  attacks }
```

of $\gamma = 0.3$ for MNIST and $\gamma = 0.03125$ for CIFAR-10. The architectures used for f_s and f_t and additional metrics (e.g. competitive ratios) can be found in §D.

Baselines. To evaluate the utility of picking adversarial examples using online algorithms we rely on two main baselines. First, we use a NAIVE baseline—a lower bound on achievable performance—where the examples to attack are picked uniformly at random, and an upper bound with the OPT baseline where attacks, while crafted using f_s , are submitted by using the true value v_i and thus utilizes f_t .

Q1: Utility of using an online algorithm. We first investigate the utility of using an online algorithm in selecting data points to attack in comparison to the NAIVE baseline. For a given permutation π and an attack method (FGSM or PGD), we compute the online fool rate of the NAIVE baseline and online algorithms as F_π^{NAIVE} , $F_\pi^{\mathcal{A}}$ respectively. In Fig. 4, we uniformly sample 20 permutations $\pi_i \sim \mathcal{S}_n$, $i \in [n]$, of $\mathcal{D}$ and plot a scatter graph of points with coordinates $(F_{\pi_i}^{\text{NAIVE}}, F_{\pi_i}^{\mathcal{A}})$, for different online algorithms $\mathcal{A}$, attacks with $k = 1000$,² and datasets. The line $y = x$ corresponds to the NAIVE baseline performance—i.e. points with coordinates $(F_{\pi_i}^{\text{NAIVE}}, F_{\pi_i}^{\text{NAIVE}})$ —and each point above that line corresponds to an online algorithm that outperforms the naive baseline on a specific permutation π_i . As observed, all online algorithms significantly outperform the NAIVE baseline, on sampled π_i ’s with an average aggregate improvement of 7.5% and 34.1% on MNIST and CIFAR-10.

Q2: Online Attacks on Non-Robust Classifiers. While previous work on online algorithms focused largely on the theoretical contribution, we are equally interested in their performance in practical applications, where the assumptions of the theory may not necessarily hold anymore. We thus decide to propose the first comparison of online algorithms in the context of attacking non-robust MNIST and CIFAR-10 classifiers. We report the average performance of all online algorithms, VIRTUAL+ with $t = \alpha^* n$ as in Eq. 8,

²[https://github.com/MadryLab/\[x\]_challenge](https://github.com/MadryLab/[x]_challenge), for $[x] \in \{\text{MNIST}, \text{CIFAR10}\}$.




Figure 4: Plot of online fool rates for $k = 1000$ against PGD-robust models using different online algorithms $\mathcal{A}$, attacks, datasets, and 20 different permutations. For a given x -coordinate, a higher y -coordinate is better. The line $y = x$ corresponds to the NAIVE baseline.

Table 1: Online fool rate on non-robust models using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms. For a given attack and value of k : $\bullet$ at least 97%, $\bullet$ at least 95%, $\bullet$ at least 90%, $\bullet$ less than 90% of the optimal performance achievable given by OPT in **bold**.

Algorithm		MNIST (Online fool rate in %)			CIFAR-10 (Online fool rate in %)		
		$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
FGSM	NAIVE (Lower-bound)	64.1 $\pm$ 32.2	47.8 $\pm$ 30.7	45.7 $\pm$ 30.7	60.7 $\pm$ 16.1	59.2 $\pm$ 6.2	59.2 $\pm$ 4.3
	OPT (Upper-bound)	87.0 $\pm$ 0.5	84.7 $\pm$ 0.5	83.6 $\pm$ 0.4	86.6 $\pm$ 0.4	87.3 $\pm$ 0.3	86.5 $\pm$ 0.2
	OPTIMISTIC	79.0 $\pm$ 0.5	77.6 $\pm$ 0.4	75.3 $\pm$ 0.4	75.3 $\pm$ 0.5	72.8 $\pm$ 0.2	71.9 $\pm$ 0.2
	VIRTUAL	78.6 $\pm$ 0.5	79.1 $\pm$ 0.4	77.4 $\pm$ 0.4	76.1 $\pm$ 0.5	77.1 $\pm$ 0.2	75.4 $\pm$ 0.2
	SINGLE-REF	85.1 $\pm$ 0.5	83.0 $\pm$ 0.5	72.3 $\pm$ 0.5	80.4 $\pm$ 0.5	84.0 $\pm$ 0.3	66.0 $\pm$ 0.2
	VIRTUAL+	80.4 $\pm$ 0.5	82.5 $\pm$ 0.4	82.9 $\pm$ 0.4	82.9 $\pm$ 0.5	86.3 $\pm$ 0.3	85.2 $\pm$ 0.2
PGD	NAIVE (lower bound)	69.7 $\pm$ 15.6	67.2 $\pm$ 19.1	67.9 $\pm$ 17.4	72.5 $\pm$ 17.6	70.4 $\pm$ 9.4	68.6 $\pm$ 6.3
	OPT (Upper-bound)	73.6 $\pm$ 0.9	49.8 $\pm$ 0.8	49.6 $\pm$ 0.8	83.7 $\pm$ 0.6	80.6 $\pm$ 0.6	79.9 $\pm$ 0.5
	OPTIMISTIC	66.2 $\pm$ 1.1	48.2 $\pm$ 0.8	45.1 $\pm$ 0.9	79.1 $\pm$ 0.6	76.6 $\pm$ 0.4	76.0 $\pm$ 0.4
	VIRTUAL	63.4 $\pm$ 1.1	46.2 $\pm$ 0.9	46.8 $\pm$ 0.8	78.3 $\pm$ 0.6	77.5 $\pm$ 0.5	76.9 $\pm$ 0.4
	SINGLE-REF	71.5 $\pm$ 0.9	49.7 $\pm$ 0.8	42.9 $\pm$ 0.9	80.2 $\pm$ 0.6	79.6 $\pm$ 0.5	74.5 $\pm$ 0.4
	VIRTUAL+	68.2 $\pm$ 1.0	49.3 $\pm$ 0.8	49.7 $\pm$ 0.8	81.2 $\pm$ 0.6	80.1 $\pm$ 0.6	79.5 $\pm$ 0.5

and the optimal offline algorithm OPT in Tab. 1. For MNIST, we find that the two best online algorithms are SINGLE-REF and our proposed VIRTUAL+ which approach the upper bound provided by OPT. For $k = 10$ and $k = 100$, SINGLE-REF is slightly superior while $k = 1000$ VIRTUAL+ is the best method with an average relative improvement of 15.3%. This is unsurprising as VIRTUAL+ does not have any additional hyperparameters unlike SINGLE-REF which appears more sensitive to the choice of optimal thresholds and reference ranks, both of which are unknown beyond $k = 100$ and non-trivial to find in closed form (see §D.2 for details). On CIFAR-10, we observe that VIRTUAL+ is the best approach regardless of attack strategy and the online attack budget k . A notable observation is that even relatively simple and common attack strategies like FGSM and PGD can be turned into very strong transfer attack strategies which significantly increase the attack success rate when paired with an appropriate $\mathcal{A}$. This further highlights the utility of carefully

choosing data points to attack in the online setting as a significant factor in achieving high online fool rates.

Q3: Online Attacks on Robust Classifiers. We now test the feasibility of online attacks against classifiers robustified using adversarial training. To do so, we adapt the public Madry Challenge [Madry et al., 2017] to the online setting, by attacking a subset of the test set as it is streamed. We report the average performance of each online algorithm in Table 2. We observe that VIRTUAL+ (with t as in Eq. 8) is the best online algorithms, outperforming VIRTUAL and OPTIMISTIC, in all settings except for $k = 10$ on MNIST where SINGLE-REF is slightly better. An interesting observation for CIFAR-10 is that attacks on robust models in comparison to non-robust models lead to higher success rates in the online setting. We reconcile this counter-intuitive fact by noting that even when $k = 1000$, it corresponds to only 10% of the test set while a PGD-attack can transfer with 38.7% efficacy on the robust model for the entire test set. Thus, the

Table 2: Online fool rate on robust models using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms. For a given attack and value of k : ● at least 90%, ● at least 80%, ● at least 70%, ● less than 70% of the optimal performance achievable given by OPT in **bold**.

Algorithm	MNIST (Online fool rate in %)			CIFAR-10 (Online fool rate in %)		
	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
NAIVE (lower bound)	2.1 ± 4.5	2.1 ± 1.4	2.1 ± 0.4	31.9 ± 14.2	32.6 ± 4.7	32.5 ± 1.5
OPT (Upper-bound)	80.0 ± 0.0	55.0 ± 0.0	18.9 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	97.2 ± 0.0
FGSM	OPTIMISTIC	49.7 ± 0.6	25.7 ± 0.1	9.7 ± 0.0	72.4 ± 0.5	64.6 ± 0.1
	VIRTUAL	49.8 ± 0.5	27.8 ± 0.1	8.1 ± 0.0	75.1 ± 0.5	74.3 ± 0.1
	SINGLE-REF	62.0 ± 0.7	45.2 ± 0.2	10.2 ± 0.0	84.3 ± 0.6	90.9 ± 0.3
	VIRTUAL+	68.2 ± 0.5	42.2 ± 0.1	12.7 ± 0.0	91.5 ± 0.4	96.5 ± 0.1
NAIVE (lower bound)	1.8 ± 4.1	1.9 ± 1.4	1.9 ± 0.4	39.1 ± 14.2	38.9 ± 4.4	38.7 ± 1.5
OPT (Upper-bound)	58.9 ± 0.4	39.9 ± 0.1	16.1 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	100.0 ± 0.0	98.0 ± 0.0
PGD	OPTIMISTIC	34.9 ± 0.5	19.2 ± 0.1	8.2 ± 0.0	75.4 ± 1.9	68.5 ± 0.4
	VIRTUAL	35.4 ± 0.5	21.8 ± 0.1	7.2 ± 0.0	78.1 ± 1.7	77.3 ± 0.5
	SINGLE-REF	44.1 ± 0.6	33.9 ± 0.2	8.3 ± 0.0	86.2 ± 2.2	91.9 ± 0.9
	VIRTUAL+	48.3 ± 0.5	32.8 ± 0.1	11.1 ± 0.0	92.2 ± 1.3	97.1 ± 0.4

efficiency of an online attacks requires the ability to detect the optimal examples to attack than the global robustness of a model which is highly influenced by the distribution of $\mathcal{V}_i$. For instance, if the value of the examples that correspond to a successful attack cannot be distinguished from the ones that are unsuccessful, then one cannot hope to use an online algorithm—that only observe values—to always manage to pick successful attacks. We empirically verify that these distributions of values $\mathcal{V}_i$ for CIFAR-10 robust and non-robust models are relatively different in §E.

6 Related Work

Adversarial attacks. The idea of attacking deep neural networks was first introduced in [Szegedy et al., 2014, Goodfellow et al., 2015], and recent years have witnessed the introduction of challenging threat models, such as blackbox attacks Chen et al. [2017], Ilyas et al. [2018], Jiang et al. [2019], Bose et al. [2020], Chakraborty et al. [2018] as well as defense strategies Madry et al. [2017], Tramèr et al. [2018], Ding et al. [2020]. Closest to our setting are adversarial attacks against real-time systems Gong et al. [2019a,b] and more broadly against deep reinforcement learning agents Lin et al. [2017], Sun et al. [2020]. However, unlike our work, these approaches are not online algorithms and do not impose constraints of transiency and online attack budgets.

k -secretary. The classical secretary problem was originally proposed by Gardner [1960] and later solved in Dynkin [1963] with an $(1/e)$ -optimal algorithm. Kleinberg [2005] introduced the k -secretary problem and an asymptotically optimal algorithm which achieves a com-

petitive ratio of $1 - \Theta(\sqrt{1/k})$. As outlined in §3.2 for $k = 2$ an optimal algorithm exists Chan et al. [2014], but requires the analysis of involved LPs that grow with the size of $\mathcal{D}$. A parallel line of work dubbed the prophet secretary problem, considers online problems where—unlike §4.1—some information on the distribution of values is known *a priori* Azar et al. [2014, 2018], Esfandiari et al. [2017]. Secretary problems have also been applied to machine learning, via machine-learned advice which informs the online algorithm about the inputs before execution Antoniadis et al. [2020], Dütting et al. [2020]. Finally, other interesting secretary settings, in addition to the random order model, include playing with adversaries Bradac et al. [2020], Kaplan et al. [2020].

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we formulate the online adversarial attack problem, a novel threat model to study adversarial attacks on streaming data. We propose VIRTUAL+, a simple yet practical online algorithm that enables attackers to select easy to fool data points while being theoretically the best single threshold algorithm for $k = 2$. We further introduce the stochastic k -secretary problem and prove fundamental results on the competitive ratio of any online algorithm operating in this new setting. Our work sheds light on the tight coupling between optimally selecting data points using an online algorithm and the final attack success rate, enabling weak adversaries to perform on par with stronger ones at no additional cost. Investigating, the optimal threshold values for larger values of k along with competitive analysis for the general setting is a natural direction for future work.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Reyhane Askari Hemmat, Tiago Salvador and Noah Marshall for reviewing early drafts of this work.

Funding. This work is partially supported by the Canada CIFAR AI Chair Program (held at Mila). Joey Bose was also supported by an IVADO PhD fellowship. Simon Lacoste-Julien and Pascal Vincent are CIFAR Associate Fellows in the Learning in Machines & Brains program. Finally, we thank Facebook for access to computational resources.

Contributions

Andjela Mladenovic and *Gauthier Gidel* formulated the online adversarial attacks setting by drawing parallels to the k -secretary problem, with *Andjela Mladenovic* leading the theoretical investigation and theoretical results. *Avishek Joey Bose* conceived the idea of online attacks, drove the writing of the paper and helped *Andjela Mladenovic* with experimental results on synthetic data. *Hugo Berard* was the chief architect behind all experimental results on MNIST and CIFAR-10. *William L. Hamilton*, *Simon Lacoste-Julien* and *Pascal Vincent* provided feedback and guidance over this research while *Gauthier Gidel* supervised the core technical execution of the theory.

References

- Naveed Akhtar and Ajmal Mian. Threat of adversarial attacks on deep learning in computer vision: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 2018.
- Susanne Albers and Leon Ladewig. New results for the k -secretary problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00488*, 2020.
- Susanne Albers, Arindam Khan, and Leon Ladewig. Improved online algorithms for knapsack and gap in the random order model. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, 2019.
- Antonios Antoniadis, Themis Gouleakis, Pieter Kleer, and Pavel Kolev. Secretary and online matching problems with machine learned advice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01026*, 2020.
- Pablo D Azar, Robert Kleinberg, and S Matthew Weinberg. Prophet inequalities with limited information. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. SIAM, 2014.
- Yossi Azar, Ashish Chiplunkar, and Haim Kaplan. Prophet secretary: Surpassing the $1-1/e$ barrier. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 2018.
- Moshe Babaioff, Nicole Immorlica, David Kempe, and Robert Kleinberg. A knapsack secretary problem with applications. In *Approximation, randomization, and combinatorial optimization. Algorithms and techniques*. Springer, 2007.
- Avishek Joey Bose, Gauthier Gidel, Hugo Berard, Andre Cianflone, Pascal Vincent, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and William L Hamilton. Adversarial example games. *Thirty-fourth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Domagoj Bradac, Anupam Gupta, Sahil Singla, and Goran Zuzic. Robust Algorithms for the Secretary Problem. In *ITCS*, 2020.
- Niv Buchbinder, Kamal Jain, and Mohit Singh. Secretary problems via linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(1):190–206, 2014.
- Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Magnet and efficient defenses against adversarial attacks are not robust to adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.08478*, 2017.
- Anirban Chakraborty, Manaar Alam, Vishal Dey, Anupam Chattopadhyay, and Debdeep Mukhopadhyay. Adversarial attacks and defences: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00069*, 2018.
- TH Hubert Chan, Fei Chen, and Shaofeng H-C Jiang. Revealing optimal thresholds for generalized secretary problem via continuous lp: impacts on online k-item auction and bipartite k-matching with random arrival order. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2014.
- Pin-Yu Chen, Huan Zhang, Yash Sharma, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Zoo: Zeroth order optimization based black-box attacks to deep neural networks without training substitute models. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*. ACM, 2017.
- Gavin Weiguang Ding, Yash Sharma, Kry Yik Chau Lui, and Ruitong Huang. MMA training: Direct input space margin maximization through adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Paul Dütting, Silvio Lattanzi, Renato Paes Leme, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Secretaries with advice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06726*, 2020.
- Evgenii Borisovich Dynkin. The optimum choice of the instant for stopping a markov process. *Soviet Mathematics*, 1963.

- Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Vahid Liaghat, and Morteza Monemizadeh. Prophet secretary. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 2017.
- Thomas S Ferguson et al. Who solved the secretary problem? *Statistical science*, 1989.
- Martin Gardner. Mathematical games. *Scientific American*, 1960.
- Yuan Gong, Boyang Li, Christian Poellabauer, and Yiyu Shi. Real-time adversarial attacks. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence IJCAI-19*, 2019a.
- Yuan Gong, Jian Yang, Jacob Huber, Mitchell MacKnight, and Christian Poellabauer. ReMASC: Realistic Replay Attack Corpus for Voice Controlled Systems. In *Proc. Interspeech 2019*, 2019b.
- Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *Third International Conference of Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016.
- Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.
- Andrew Ilyas, Logan Engstrom, Anish Athalye, and Jessy Lin. Black-box adversarial attacks with limited queries and information. *Thirty-fifth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2018.
- Andrew Ilyas, Logan Engstrom, Anish Athalye, and Jessy Lin. Query-efficient black-box adversarial examples. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- Linxi Jiang, Xingjun Ma, Shaoxiang Chen, James Bailey, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Black-box adversarial attacks on video recognition models. In *Proceedings of the twenty-seventh ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2019.
- Haim Kaplan, David Naori, and Danny Raz. Competitive analysis with a sample and the secretary problem. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM, 2020.
- Robert D Kleinberg. A multiple-choice secretary algorithm with applications to online auctions. In *SODA*, 2005.
- Alex Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. In *Tech Report, UofT*, 2009.
- Yann LeCun and Corinna Cortes. MNIST handwritten digit database. 2010. URL <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>.
- Yen-Chen Lin, Zhang-Wei Hong, Yuan-Hong Liao, Meng-Li Shih, Ming-Yu Liu, and Min Sun. Tactics of adversarial attack on deep reinforcement learning agents. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17*, 2017.
- Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *Sixth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017.
- Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, and Ian Goodfellow. Transferability in machine learning: from phenomena to black-box attacks using adversarial samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07277*, 2016.
- Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Ian Goodfellow, Somesh Jha, Z Berkay Celik, and Ananthram Swami. Practical black-box attacks against machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. ACM, 2017.
- Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *Third International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.
- Jianwen Sun, Tianwei Zhang, Xiaofei Xie, Lei Ma, Yan Zheng, Kangjie Chen, and Yang Liu. Stealthy and efficient adversarial attacks against deep reinforcement learning. *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-20)*, 2020.
- Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *Second International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2014.
- Christian Szegedy, Vincent Vanhoucke, Sergey Ioffe, Jon Shlens, and Zbigniew Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2818–2826, 2016.
- Florian Tramèr, Alexey Kurakin, Nicolas Papernot, Ian Goodfellow, Dan Boneh, and Patrick McDaniel. Ensemble adversarial training: Attacks and defenses. *Sixth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.

Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. Wide residual networks. In *British Machine Vision Conference 2016*. British Machine Vision Association, 2016.

A Proof of Competitive Ratio for Virtual+Algorithm

We now prove Theorem 1 from the main paper reproduced here for convenience.

Theorem 1. *For $k = 2$, the competitive ratio achieved by VIRTUAL+ algorithm is equal to,*

$$C_n = \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \frac{1}{j(j-1)} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \quad (12)$$

Particularly for $t = \alpha \cdot n$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we get

$$C_n > \alpha(3(1 - \alpha) + 2\alpha \ln(\alpha)) + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \quad (13)$$

Thus, asymptotically we have

$$C > \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \alpha(3(1 - \alpha) + 2\alpha \ln(\alpha)) > .4273 > 1/e. \quad (14)$$




Figure 5: Probability of having only one element in S_A after j time-steps with the VIRTUAL+ algorithm.

Proof. First note that we can show that the competitive ratio for the k -secretary problem is equal to

$$C = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{a=1}^k \mathbb{P}(i_a \in S_A), \quad (15)$$

where i_a is the index of the a^{th} secretary picked by the offline solution —i.e. i_a is a top- k secretary of $\mathcal{D}$. Now, let us focus on the case $k = 2$. When calculating the probability of either of the top two items in $\mathcal{D}$ being picked by the VIRTUAL+ we must first compute the probability of one of the top-2 items being picked during the selection phase (time step $t + 1 \dots n$). Now notice that VIRTUAL+ picks an item at time step $j + 1$ if and only if this is a top-2 item with respect to all of $\mathcal{D}$ and $|S_A| \leq 2$ at time-step $j + 1$. Let top-2_j denote the two largest elements observed by $\mathcal{A}$ up to and inclusive of time step j . Thus, for $a \in \{1, 2\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(i_a \in S_A) &= \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(i_a \in S_A \text{ at time-step } j+1) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(|S_A| \leq 2 \text{ at time-step } j+1) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Now, we compute $\mathbb{P}(|S_A| \leq 2 \text{ at time-step } j+1)$ by decomposing this probability into the following two events: A.) $|S_A| = 0$ where the selection set is empty and B.) the event $|S_A| = 1$ where exactly one item has been picked. We now analyze each event in turn.

Event A. In order for the event $|S_A| = 0$ to occur it implies that the algorithm does not select any items in the first j rounds. This means both two top-2 _{j} elements must have appeared in the sampling phase. Thus the probability for this event is exactly $\frac{t(t-1)}{j(j-1)}$.

Event B. The second event is when $|S_A| = 1$ —i.e. the algorithm picks exactly one element in the first j rounds. The computation of this event is illustrated in Figure 5. Let's say that an element is picked at time step p . Now to compute the probability of Event B occurring we first make the following two observations:

Observation 1: In order for exactly one element to be picked at the time step $p \leq j$, this element must be one of the top- 2_j elements. Furthermore, this implies the other of the top- 2_j element —i.e. the one not picked at p must have appeared in the sampling phase. Note that if both top- 2_j elements appear after the sampling phase, the condition would be satisfied twice and two elements would be selected instead of exactly one, and if they both appeared during the sampling phase we return to Event A. As a result, the probability for this condition is given by $\frac{t}{j(j-1)}$.

Observation 2: By observation 1. we know that the online algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ picks one of the top- 2_j at time step p and the fact that the event under consideration is $|S_A| = 1$ the reference list R from time step p to $j+1$ must contain both top- 2_j elements. However, for $\mathcal{A}$ to pick *only* at p we also need to ensure that no elements are picked prior to p . Therefore, before time step p the reference list must contain top- 2_p . Again by observation 1, we know that R already contains one of the top- 2_j elements therefore we know it contains one of the top- 2_p elements. Thus the probability of ensuring that the second top- 2_p elements is also within R by time step p is $\frac{(t-1)}{(p-2)}$. Finally, since there are two top elements and they may appear in any order we must count the probability of Event B occurring twice.

Overall we get:

$$\frac{t(t-1)}{j(j-1)} + 2 \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{1}{j} \frac{t}{j-1} \frac{t-1}{p-2} \quad (17)$$

Total probability:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{t(t-1)}{j(j-1)} + 2 \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{1}{j} \frac{t}{j-1} \frac{t-1}{p-2} \right) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{p=t}^{j-1} \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{j(j-1)} + \frac{2}{j(j-1)} \sum_{p=t}^{j-1} \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \\ &> \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{j^2} + 2 \frac{1}{j^2} \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \\ &> \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{j^2} + \frac{2}{j^2} \int_{p=t+1}^{j+1} \frac{1}{p-1} dp \right) \\ &> \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{j^2} + \frac{2}{j^2} \ln \left(\frac{j}{t} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we will use the following lemma

Lemma 1. For any differentiable function f and any $a < b$, we have,

$$\sum_{j=a}^b f(j) \geq \int_a^{b+1} f(t) dt - |b+1-a| \sup_{t \in [a, b+1]} |f'(t)| \quad (18)$$

Proof.

$$|f(n) - \int_n^{n+1} f(t) dt| \leq \int_n^{n+1} |f(n) - f(t)| dt \leq \sup_{t \in [n, n+1]} |f'(t)| \quad (19)$$

Thus,

$$f(n) \geq \int_n^{n+1} f(t) dt - \sup_{t \in [n, n+1]} |f'(t)| \quad (20)$$

and by summing for $n = a \dots b$ we get the desired lemma. $\square$

Applying this lemma to $f(x) = \frac{1+2\ln(x/t)}{x^2}$, $a = t$ and $b = n - 1$, we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \frac{t(t-1)}{j(j-1)} + 2 \sum_{p=t+1}^j \frac{1}{j} \frac{t}{j-1} \frac{t-1}{p-2} > \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \sum_{j=t}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{j^2} + \frac{2}{j^2} \ln \left(\frac{j}{t} \right) \right) \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \left(\int_t^n \frac{1+2\ln(x/t)}{x^2} dx - 2(n-t) \sup_{x \in [t,n]} \left| \frac{4\ln(x/t)}{x^3} \right| \right) \\ &\geq \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \left(\int_t^n \frac{1+2\ln(x/t)}{x^2} dx - 2(n-t) \left| \frac{16}{3t^3 e^4} \right| \right) \\ &= \frac{t(t-1)}{n} \left(\frac{3}{t} - \frac{2\ln(n/t) + 3}{n} - 2(n-t) \left| \frac{16}{3t^3 e^4} \right| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Now for $t = \alpha n$ where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that lower-bound becomes

$$C \geq \alpha(3 - \alpha(3 - 2\ln(\alpha))) + \mathcal{O}(1/n), \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, 1) \quad (23)$$

The constant term of the RHS is a concave function of α that is maximized for $\alpha^* \approx 0.38240$. Thus, our algorithm achieves competitive ratio larger than 0.42737. $\square$

B Proof of Theorem 2

We now prove Theorem 2 in detail, reproduced here for convenience.

Theorem 2. *Let us consider a secretary algorithm, $\mathcal{A}$, that is C_n -competitive when given access to the true values $v_i, i \in [n]$. When having access to random variables $\mathcal{V}_i, i \in [n]$ such that Eq. 9 holds, $\mathcal{A}$ has a stochastic competitive ratio of at least:*

$$C_n \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\Delta^2}{2\sigma^2}}\right)^n \quad (24)$$

Proof. In this analysis, we will refer to a deterministic online algorithm as $\mathcal{A}$. Please note, the following statement of results holds for *any* online algorithm, therefore when introducing certain lemmas we will use algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ for the name. Furthermore, we will denote the stochastic versions of $\mathcal{A}$ as $\mathcal{A}^s$. Let $v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots, v_k^*$ be the values of top k elements and let $i_1^*, i_2^* \dots i_k^*$ be their appropriate indices. Therefore, the optimal offline solutions selects set $S^* = \{i_1^*, i_2^*, \dots, i_k^*\}$, while a deterministic online algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ chooses set S , and our online algorithm $\mathcal{A}^s$ chooses set $S^{(s)}$. Our goal is to provide a lower bound of the kind

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[|S^{(s)} \cap S^*|]}{k} \geq c \frac{\mathbb{E}[|S \cap S^*|]}{k} \quad (25)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant that depends on the randomness of the estimates $\mathcal{V}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$. Assuming that $\mathcal{A}$ is C_n -optimal, this lower bound will provide us a competitive ratio for the stochastic algorithm $\mathcal{A}^s$.

Now, by definition, the algorithm $\mathcal{A}^s$, is the algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ but operating on the random variables $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n$ (instead of $v_1, \dots, v_n$). Thus, is we call $i_a^{(s)}$ the index of the a largest value among $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n$ (note that $i_a^{(s)}$ is a random variable) we have that

$$\mathbb{P}[i_a^* \in S] = \mathbb{P}[i_a^{(s)} \in S^{(s)} | \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n] \quad (26)$$

and thus, by summing over a and taking expectation on all permutations and noting $\{i_1^{(s)}, \dots, i_k^{(s)}\} := S_s^*$

$$\mathbb{E}[|S^* \cap S|] = \mathbb{E}[|S_s^* \cap S^{(s)}| | \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n] \quad (27)$$

Now let us note that we have that the expected number indices in S^* picked by $\mathcal{A}^s$ is larger than the expected number of indices in $S_s^* \cup S^*$, formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|S^* \cap S^{(s)}|] &\geq \mathbb{E}[|S^* \cap S^{(s)} \cap S_s^*|] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}\{S^* = S_s^*\} \mathbb{E}[|S^* \cap S_s^*| | \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_n]] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(S^* = S_s^*) \mathbb{E}[|S^* \cap S|] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Now, notice that without loss of generality we can consider that $v_1 \geq \dots \geq v_n$, thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S^* = S_s^*) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}_{i_1^*} \geq \dots \geq \mathcal{V}_{i_n^*}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}_{i_1^*} \geq v_1 - \Delta \geq v_2 + \Delta \geq \mathcal{V}_{i_2^*} \geq \dots \geq \mathcal{V}_{i_n^*}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{V}_{i_a^*} - v_a| \leq \Delta, a \in [n]) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{V}_i - v_i| \leq \Delta) \\ &\geq (1 - e^{-\frac{\Delta^2}{2\sigma^2}})^n \end{aligned}$$

Where for the last inequality we used the assumption that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{V}_i - v_i| \geq \epsilon) \leq e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \forall i \in [n]. \quad (29)$$

Note that we could refine this bound by considering individual gaps Δ_i and constants σ_i and consider $\frac{\Delta}{\sigma^2} = \min_{i \in [n]} \frac{\Delta_i}{\sigma_i}$.

□

C Classical Online Algorithms for Secretary Problems

All single threshold online algorithm described in this paper include: VIRTUAL, OPTIMISTIC and SINGLE-REF. Each online algorithm consists of two phases —**sampling phase** followed by **selection phase**— and an optimal stopping point t which is used by the algorithm to transition between the phases. We now briefly summarize these two phases for the aforementioned online algorithms.

Sampling Phase - Virtual, Optimistic and Single-Ref. In the sampling phase, the algorithms passively observe all data points up to a pre-specified time index t , but also maintains a sorted reference list R consisting of the k elements with the largest values $\mathcal{V}(i)$ seen. Thus the R contains a list of elements sorted by decreasing value. That is $R[k]$ is the index of the k -th largest element in R and $\mathcal{V}(R[k])$ is its corresponding value. The elements in R are kept for comparison but are crucially *not* selected in the sampling phase.

C.1 Virtual Algorithm

Selection Phase - Virtual algorithm. Subsequently, in the selection phase, $i > t$, when an item with value $\mathcal{V}(i)$ is observed an irrevocable decision is made of whether the algorithm should select i into S . To do so, the Virtual algorithm simply checks if the value of the k -th smallest element in R , $\mathcal{V}(R[k])$, is smaller than $\mathcal{V}(i)$ in addition to possibly updating the set R . The full Virtual algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 3 VIRTUAL ALGORITHM

Inputs: $t \in [k \dots n - k]$, $R = \emptyset$, $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$

Sampling phase: Observe the first t data points and construct a list R with the indices of the top k data points seen. **sort** ensures: $\mathcal{V}(R[1]) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[2]) \dots \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$.

Selection phase (at time $i > t$):

- 1: **if** $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$ and $R[k] > t$ **then**
 - 2: $R = \text{sort}\{R \cup \{i\} \setminus \{R[k]\}\}$ {// Update R with element i and also take out $R[k]$ }
 - 3: **else if** $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$ and $R[k] \leq t$ **then**
 - 4: $R = \text{sort}\{R \cup \{i\} \setminus \{R[k]\}\}$ {// Update R with element i and also take out $R[k]$ }
 - 5: $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \{S_{\mathcal{A}} \cup \{i\}\}$ {// Select element i }
 - 6: $i \leftarrow i + 1$
-

C.2 Optimistic Algorithm

Selection Phase - Optimistic algorithm. In the optimistic algorithm, i is selected if and only if $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[\text{last}])$. Whenever i is selected, $R[\text{last}]$ is removed from the list R , but no new elements are ever added to R . Thus, intuitively, elements are selected when they beat one of the remaining reference points from R . We call this algorithm “optimistic” because it removes the reference point $R[\text{last}]$ even if $\mathcal{V}(i)$ exceeds, say, $\mathcal{V}(R[1])$. Thus, it implicitly assumes that it will see additional very valuable elements in the future, which will be added when their values exceed those of the remaining, more valuable, $R[a]$, $a \in [k]$.

Algorithm 4 OPTIMISTIC ALGORITHM

Inputs: $t \in [k \dots n - k]$, $R = \emptyset$, $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$.

Sampling phase (up to time t): Observe the first t data points and construct a list R with the indices of the top k data points seen. **sort** ensures: $\mathcal{V}(R[1]) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[2]) \dots \geq \mathcal{V}(R[k])$. Set $\text{last} = k$, to be the index of the last element in R .

Selection phase (at time $i > t$):

- 1: **if** $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[\text{last}])$ **then**
 - 2: $R = \{R \setminus \{R[\text{last}]\}\}$ {// Update R by taking out $R[k]$ }
 - 3: $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \{S_{\mathcal{A}} \cup \{i\}\}$ {// Select element i }
 - 4: $\text{last} = \text{last} - 1$
 - $i \leftarrow i + 1$
-

C.3 Single-Ref Algorithm

Selection Phase - Single-Ref algorithm. In the SINGLE-REF algorithm, i is selected if and only if $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq \mathcal{V}(R[r])$ and we haven't already selected k elements. We call this algorithm single reference algorithm because we always compare incoming elements to one single reference element, that was determined in the sampling phase.

Algorithm 5 SINGLE-REF ALGORITHM

Inputs: $t \in [k \dots n - k]$, $R = \emptyset$, $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$, $r \in [k]$ (reference rank)

Sampling phase (up to time t): Observe the first t data points and construct a list R with the indices of the top k data points seen. Let $s_r = R[r]$ be the r -th best item from the sampling phase.

Selection phase (at time $i > t$):

1: **if** $\mathcal{V}(i) \geq s_r$ and $|S_{\mathcal{A}}| \leq k$ **then**

2: $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \{S_{\mathcal{A}} \cup \{i\}\}$

$i \leftarrow i + 1$

{// Choose the first k items better than s_r }

D Additional Experimental Results

D.1 Additional Results on Synthetic Data

We now provide additional results on Synthetic Data with varying levels of noise added to each item in $\mathcal{D}$. In particular, we investigate in figure 6 online algorithms in the face of no noise —i.e. $\sigma^2 = 0$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, and $\sigma^2 = 5$ in addition to $\sigma^2 = 10$ reported in figure 3. The deterministic setting corresponds to $\sigma^2 = 0$ while $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\sigma^2 = 5$ correspond to the stochastic setting as introduced in section 4.




Figure 6: Estimation of the competitive ratio of online algorithms under various noise levels. **Left:** Deterministic setting with $\sigma^2 = 0$. **Middle:** Stochastic setting with $\sigma^2 = 1$. **Right:** Stochastic setting with $\sigma^2 = 5$.

D.2 Experimental Details

We provide more details about the experiments presented in section 5. For further details we also invite the reader to look at the code provided with the supplementary materials.

Attack strategies We use two different attack strategies the Fast Gradient Sign Method (FGSM) [Goodfellow et al., 2015] and 40 iterations of the PGD attack [Madry et al., 2017] with l_∞ .

Hyper-parameters of online algorithms All the online algorithms except SINGLE-REF have a single hyper-parameters to choose which is the length of the sampling phase t . For VIRTUAL and OPTIMISTIC we use $t = \lfloor \frac{t}{e} \rfloor$ which is the value suggested by theory in Babaioff et al. [2007]. For VIRTUAL+ we use $t = \alpha n$ as in Eq. 8 which is the value suggested by Theorem 1. SINGLE-REF has two hyper-parameters to choose the threshold t (c in the original paper) and reference rank r . For $k = 1 \dots 100$ the values are given in Albers and Ladewig [2020] and are numerical solutions to combinatorial optimization problems. However, for $k = 1000$ no values are specified and we choose $c = 0.13$ and $r = 40$ through grid search. Indeed, these values may not be optimal ones but we leave the choice of better values as future work.

MNIST model architectures For table 1, f_s and f_t are chosen randomly from an ensemble of trained classifiers. The ensemble is composed of five different architectures described in table 3, with 5 trained models per architecture.

A	B	C	D
Conv(64, 5, 5) + Relu	Dropout(0.2)	Conv(128, 3, 3) + Tanh	FC(300) + Relu
Conv(64, 5, 5) + Relu	Conv(64, 8, 8) + Relu	MaxPool(2,2)	Dropout(0.5)
Dropout(0.25)	Conv(128, 6, 6) + Relu	Conv(64, 3, 3) + Tanh	FC(300) + Relu
FC(128) + Relu	Conv(128, 6, 6) + Relu	MaxPool(2,2)	Dropout(0.5)
Dropout(0.5)	Dropout(0.5)	FC(128) + Relu	FC(300) + Relu
FC + Softmax	FC + Softmax	FC + Softmax	Dropout(0.5)
			FC(300) + Relu
			Dropout(0.5)
			FC + Softmax

Table 3: The different MNIST Architectures used for f_s and f_t

CIFAR model architectures For table 1, f_s and f_t are chosen randomly from an ensemble of trained classifiers. The ensemble is composed of five different architectures: VGG-16 [Simonyan and Zisserman, 2015], ResNet-18 (RN-18) [He et al., 2016], Wide ResNet (WR) [Zagoruyko and Komodakis, 2016], DenseNet-121 (DN-121) [Huang et al., 2017] and Inception-V3 architectures (Inc-V3) [Szegedy et al., 2016], with 5 trained models per architecture.

D.3 Additional metrics

In addition to the results provided in table 1, we also provide two other metrics here: the stochastic competitive ratio in table 4 and the knapsack ratio table 5. Where the knapsack ratio is defined as the sum value of S_A —i.e. the sum of total loss, as selected by the online algorithm divided by the value of S^* selected by the optimal offline algorithm. We observe that the competitive ratio is not always a good metric to compare the actual performance of the different algorithms, since sometimes the online algorithm with the best competitive ratio is not the algorithm with the best fool rate. The knapsack ratio on the other hand seems to be a much better proxy for the actual performance of the algorithms, this is due to the fact that we’re interested in picking elements that have have a good chance to fool the target classifier but are not necessarily the best possible attack.

Table 4: Competitive ratio on non-robust models using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms.

		MNIST (competitive ratio)			CIFAR-10 (competitive ratio)		
Algorithm		$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
FGSM	NAIVE (Lower-bound)	.006 $\pm$.001	.010 $\pm$.000	.098 $\pm$.000	.002 $\pm$.000	.010 $\pm$.000	.100 $\pm$.000
	OPTIMISTIC	.063 $\pm$.004	.083 $\pm$.003	.197 $\pm$.003	.035 $\pm$.002	.064 $\pm$.001	.203 $\pm$.001
	VIRTUAL	.048 $\pm$.003	.079 $\pm$.003	.201 $\pm$.003	.030 $\pm$.002	.073 $\pm$.001	.212 $\pm$.001
	SINGLE-REF	.070 $\pm$.004	.135 $\pm$.006	.181 $\pm$.003	.045 $\pm$.002	.109 $\pm$.002	.174 $\pm$.001
	VIRTUAL+	.072 $\pm$.004	.124 $\pm$.005	.270 $\pm$.005	.043 $\pm$.002	.107 $\pm$.002	.287 $\pm$.002
PGD	NAIVE (lower bound)	.005 $\pm$.001	.010 $\pm$.000	.098 $\pm$.000	.001 $\pm$.000	.010 $\pm$.000	.100 $\pm$.000
	OPTIMISTIC	.023 $\pm$.002	.036 $\pm$.001	.156 $\pm$.001	.033 $\pm$.002	.052 $\pm$.002	.157 $\pm$.002
	VIRTUAL	.011 $\pm$.001	.049 $\pm$.001	.173 $\pm$.001	.028 $\pm$.002	.056 $\pm$.002	.160 $\pm$.002
	SINGLE-REF	.032 $\pm$.002	.067 $\pm$.002	.135 $\pm$.001	.042 $\pm$.003	.087 $\pm$.003	.145 $\pm$.001
	VIRTUAL+	.023 $\pm$.002	.059 $\pm$.002	.215 $\pm$.002	.040 $\pm$.002	.081 $\pm$.003	.200 $\pm$.003

Table 5: Knapsack ratio on non-robust models using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms.

		MNIST (knapsack ratio in %)			CIFAR-10 (knapsack ratio in %)		
Algorithm		$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
FGSM	NAIVE (Lower-bound)	19.0 $\pm$ 0.3	19.5 $\pm$ 0.2	29.9 $\pm$ 0.2	16.8 $\pm$ 0.2	20.3 $\pm$ 0.1	28.7 $\pm$ 0.1
	OPTIMISTIC	33.0 $\pm$ 0.6	33.1 $\pm$ 0.3	42.1 $\pm$ 0.3	32.7 $\pm$ 0.4	34.1 $\pm$ 0.2	42.8 $\pm$ 0.2
	VIRTUAL	30.8 $\pm$ 0.5	34.2 $\pm$ 0.3	42.9 $\pm$ 0.3	32.9 $\pm$ 0.4	37.8 $\pm$ 0.2	45.0 $\pm$ 0.2
	SINGLE-REF	39.7 $\pm$ 0.6	41.5 $\pm$ 0.6	40.2 $\pm$ 0.3	37.5 $\pm$ 0.5	45.7 $\pm$ 0.4	37.9 $\pm$ 0.1
	VIRTUAL+	36.2 $\pm$ 0.6	41.1 $\pm$ 0.6	51.4 $\pm$ 0.5	39.4 $\pm$ 0.5	47.1 $\pm$ 0.4	55.5 $\pm$ 0.3
PGD	NAIVE (lower bound)	27.2 $\pm$ 0.6	15.5 $\pm$ 0.3	25.9 $\pm$ 0.3	22.5 $\pm$ 0.3	26.8 $\pm$ 0.2	36.3 $\pm$ 0.2
	OPTIMISTIC	37.2 $\pm$ 0.9	24.2 $\pm$ 0.5	35.8 $\pm$ 0.4	35.3 $\pm$ 0.6	35.6 $\pm$ 0.4	43.1 $\pm$ 0.4
	VIRTUAL	35.6 $\pm$ 0.9	27.5 $\pm$ 0.6	38.8 $\pm$ 0.4	35.5 $\pm$ 0.6	37.2 $\pm$ 0.5	43.9 $\pm$ 0.4
	SINGLE-REF	46.9 $\pm$ 1.1	34.3 $\pm$ 0.8	32.3 $\pm$ 0.5	39.0 $\pm$ 0.7	42.6 $\pm$ 0.6	41.2 $\pm$ 0.3
	VIRTUAL+	41.5 $\pm$ 1.1	32.3 $\pm$ 0.8	46.5 $\pm$ 0.6	40.9 $\pm$ 0.7	42.9 $\pm$ 0.6	48.8 $\pm$ 0.5

Table 6: Competitive ratio on robust models using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms.

Algorithm		MNIST (competitive ratio)			CIFAR-10 (competitive ratio)		
		$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
FGSM	NAIVE (Lower-bound)	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00
	OPTIMISTIC	0.24 $\pm$ 0.00	0.17 $\pm$ 0.00	0.33 $\pm$ 0.00	0.05 $\pm$ 0.00	0.21 $\pm$ 0.00	0.33 $\pm$ 0.00
	VIRTUAL	0.18 $\pm$ 0.00	0.17 $\pm$ 0.00	0.33 $\pm$ 0.00	0.09 $\pm$ 0.00	0.22 $\pm$ 0.00	0.33 $\pm$ 0.00
	SINGLE-REF	0.27 $\pm$ 0.00	0.31 $\pm$ 0.00	0.28 $\pm$ 0.00	0.07 $\pm$ 0.00	0.39 $\pm$ 0.00	0.28 $\pm$ 0.00
	VIRTUAL+	0.25 $\pm$ 0.00	0.27 $\pm$ 0.00	0.49 $\pm$ 0.00	0.11 $\pm$ 0.00	0.35 $\pm$ 0.00	0.49 $\pm$ 0.00
PGD	NAIVE (Lower-bound)	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00
	OPTIMISTIC	0.10 $\pm$ 0.00	0.13 $\pm$ 0.00	0.32 $\pm$ 0.00	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00	0.15 $\pm$ 0.00	0.31 $\pm$ 0.00
	VIRTUAL	0.09 $\pm$ 0.00	0.14 $\pm$ 0.00	0.32 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.16 $\pm$ 0.00	0.32 $\pm$ 0.00
	SINGLE-REF	0.12 $\pm$ 0.00	0.23 $\pm$ 0.00	0.27 $\pm$ 0.00	0.01 $\pm$ 0.00	0.25 $\pm$ 0.00	0.27 $\pm$ 0.00
	VIRTUAL+	0.13 $\pm$ 0.00	0.21 $\pm$ 0.00	0.48 $\pm$ 0.00	0.02 $\pm$ 0.00	0.25 $\pm$ 0.00	0.47 $\pm$ 0.00

Table 7: Knapsack ratio on robust models using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms.

Algorithm		MNIST (knapsack ratio in %)			CIFAR-10 (knapsack ratio in %)		
		$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$	$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
FGSM	NAIVE (lower bound)	1.2 $\pm$ 0.1	2.2 $\pm$ 0.0	10.5 $\pm$ 0.1	9.9 $\pm$ 0.2	12.5 $\pm$ 0.1	19.7 $\pm$ 0.0
	OPTIMISTIC	38.0 $\pm$ 0.5	26.5 $\pm$ 0.1	44.6 $\pm$ 0.1	48.8 $\pm$ 0.5	45.2 $\pm$ 0.1	48.3 $\pm$ 0.0
	VIRTUAL	35.6 $\pm$ 0.4	27.0 $\pm$ 0.1	38.0 $\pm$ 0.1	50.9 $\pm$ 0.3	52.5 $\pm$ 0.1	50.0 $\pm$ 0.0
	SINGLE-REF	46.9 $\pm$ 0.5	45.2 $\pm$ 0.2	46.4 $\pm$ 0.1	59.7 $\pm$ 0.6	73.1 $\pm$ 0.3	41.3 $\pm$ 0.1
	VIRTUAL+	49.2 $\pm$ 0.4	41.2 $\pm$ 0.1	58.6 $\pm$ 0.1	66.2 $\pm$ 0.4	74.5 $\pm$ 0.1	70.5 $\pm$ 0.0
PGD	NAIVE (lower bound)	1.3 $\pm$ 0.1	2.4 $\pm$ 0.0	10.7 $\pm$ 0.1	11.9 $\pm$ 0.6	14.6 $\pm$ 0.2	21.8 $\pm$ 0.1
	OPTIMISTIC	31.1 $\pm$ 0.5	24.4 $\pm$ 0.1	42.7 $\pm$ 0.1	46.0 $\pm$ 1.4	45.3 $\pm$ 0.3	49.2 $\pm$ 0.1
	VIRTUAL	29.9 $\pm$ 0.4	26.3 $\pm$ 0.1	37.9 $\pm$ 0.1	49.4 $\pm$ 1.2	52.4 $\pm$ 0.3	51.6 $\pm$ 0.1
	SINGLE-REF	39.5 $\pm$ 0.5	41.8 $\pm$ 0.2	43.3 $\pm$ 0.1	56.1 $\pm$ 2.1	69.5 $\pm$ 0.9	42.0 $\pm$ 0.4
	VIRTUAL+	41.3 $\pm$ 0.4	39.7 $\pm$ 0.1	57.9 $\pm$ 0.1	63.4 $\pm$ 1.2	72.7 $\pm$ 0.3	71.2 $\pm$ 0.1

D.4 Additional results

Same architecture In addition to table 1 we also provide some results on MNIST where f_s and f_t always have the same architecture but have different weights. This is a slightly less challenging setting as shown in Bose et al. [2020], we also observe that in this setting the adversaries are very effective against the target model.

Table 8: Fool rate on non-robust models, where f_s and f_t have the same architecture, using FGSM and PGD attacker and various online algorithms.

Algorithm		MNIST (Fool rate in %)		
		$k = 10$	$k = 100$	$k = 1000$
FGSM	NAIVE (lower bound)	73.5 ± 0.5	72.3 ± 0.4	72.6 ± 0.4
	OPT (Upper-bound)	100.0 ± 0.0	99.7 ± 0.0	98.6 ± 0.1
	OPTIMISTIC	89.8 ± 0.4	86.0 ± 0.2	84.9 ± 0.2
	VIRTUAL	90.3 ± 0.3	90.0 ± 0.2	88.1 ± 0.2
	SINGLE-REF	94.0 ± 0.3	96.3 ± 0.2	79.3 ± 0.3
	VIRTUAL+	96.9 ± 0.2	98.6 ± 0.1	97.5 ± 0.1
	NAIVE (lower bound)	91.1 ± 0.5	90.2 ± 0.4	90.0 ± 0.3
	OPT (Upper-bound)	98.5 ± 0.2	98.0 ± 0.1	97.4 ± 0.1
PGD	OPTIMISTIC	95.3 ± 0.3	93.8 ± 0.2	93.5 ± 0.2
	VIRTUAL	95.5 ± 0.3	95.2 ± 0.2	94.4 ± 0.2
	SINGLE-REF	96.7 ± 0.3	96.9 ± 0.2	92.0 ± 0.3
	VIRTUAL+	97.1 ± 0.3	97.6 ± 0.1	97.0 ± 0.1

E Distribution of Values Observed By Online Algorithms

In this section we further investigate performance disparity of online algorithms against robust and non-robust models for CIFAR-10 as observed in Tables 1 and 2. We hypothesize that one possible explanation can be found through analyzing the ratio distribution of values $\mathcal{V}_i$'s for unsuccessful and successful attacks as observed by the online algorithm when attacking each model type. However, note that eventhough an online adversary may employ a fixed attack strategy to craft an attack $x' = \text{ATT}(x)$ the scale of values in each setting are not strictly comparable as the attack is performed on different model types. In other words, given an ATT it is significantly more difficult to attack a robust model and thus we can expect a lower $\mathcal{V}_i$ when compared to attacking a non-robust model. Thus to investigate the difference in efficacy of online attacks we pursue a distributional argument.

Indeed, distributions of $\mathcal{V}_i$'s observed, for a specific permutation of $\mathcal{D}$, may drastically affect the performance of the online algorithms. Consider for instance, if the $\mathcal{V}_i$'s that correspond to successful attacks cannot be distinguished from the ones that are unsuccessful. In such a case one cannot hope to use an online algorithm—that only observes $\mathcal{V}_i$'s—to always correctly pick successful attacks. In Figure 7 we visualize the distribution of $\mathcal{V}_i$'s of unsuccessful and successful attacks as a density ratio for CIFAR-10 robust and non-robust models. We plot the distribution of $\mathcal{V}_i$'s (x-axis) with respect to the density ratio of unsuccessful versus successful attack vectors (y-axis) as provided by a kernel density estimator. As observed, the tail of the distribution in the non-robust case is heavier than in the robust case which indicates that there are many data points with high values that lead to unsuccessful attacks. Furthermore, this also suggests one explanation for the higher efficacy of online algorithms against robust models: fewer attacks are successful but they are easier to differentiate from unsuccessful ones. Importantly, this implies that given an online attack budget $k \ll n$ higher online fool rates can be achieved against robust models as the selected data points turn adversarial with higher probability when compared to non-robust models.




Figure 7: Distribution of the values for robust and non-robust models. We use a gaussian kernel density estimator to estimate the density.