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Abstract

Adversarial examples can deceive a deep neural network (DNN) by significantly altering its response with imperceptible perturbations, which poses new potential vulnerabilities as the growing ubiquity of DNNs. However, most of the existing adversarial examples cannot maintain the malicious functionality if we apply an affine transformation on the resultant examples, which is an important measurement to the robustness of adversarial attacks for the practical risks [3]. To address this issue, we propose an affine-invariant adversarial attack which can consistently construct adversarial examples robust over a distribution of affine transformation. To further improve the efficiency, we propose to disentangle the affine transformation into rotations, translations, magnifications, and reformulate the transformation in polar space. Afterwards, we construct an affine-invariant gradient estimator by convolving the gradient at the original image with derived kernels, which can be integrated with any gradient-based attack methods. Extensive experiments on the ImageNet demonstrate that our method can consistently produce more robust adversarial examples under significant affine transformations, and as a byproduct, improve the transferability of adversarial examples compared with the alternative state-of-the-art methods.

1. Introduction

Deep neural networks have been widely used in image recognition [18, 33], medical image analysis [32, 25], autonomous driving [1, 17], etc. However, recent researches show that deep neural networks are highly vulnerable to adversarial examples [36, 4, 16]. By adding artificially designed small perturbations to the input images, the accuracy of image recognition can degenerate significantly. The existence of adversarial examples may cause safety problems to numerous real-world applications based on DNNs, which has drawn great attention consequently.

Various adversarial attack methods have been proposed to generate robust and imperceptible adversarial examples, including Fast Gradient Sign Method (FGSM) [16], Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) [26], and Carlini & Wag-
ner’s method (C&W) [6], etc. However, most of these algorithms did not consider the affine transformation to the input images, which may influence the robustness of attacks [3]. As shown in Fig. 1, the resultant adversarial images generally fail to evade the classifier under affine transformation, which limits its relevance to the more practical risks. Therefore, it is imperative to generate adversarial examples that can maintain the malicious functionality to fool the classifier under affine transformation, which serves as a good measurement for the robustness of adversarial attacks.

Previous works, such as Expectation Over Transformation (EOT) [3] and Robust Physical Perturbations (RP2) [14], sample from a transformation distribution to make the adversarial examples more robust. However, most of these works did not formally build a generic affine model, which may degrade the performance of attack methods. Besides, the sampling process brings high computational complexity, yielding low generation efficiency of adversarial examples.

1.1. Our Proposal

To address the aforementioned issues, we propose a novel method with an affine-invariant gradient estimator to generate more robust adversarial examples against general affine transformation. Specifically, we formulate the attack problem as an optimization to maximize the expectation of adversarial loss over the affine transformation. The adversarial perturbations are generated through an ensemble of images composed of a legitimate one and its affine-transformed versions. Afterwards, we decompose the affine transformation into translation, rotation, and scaling, and derive their transformation invariance, respectively.

To improve the calculation efficiency of the gradient estimator, we derive a kernel-based estimator to approximate the affine-invariant gradient by convolving the original gradient with the specific kernels. As to the translation transformation, we implement the convolution operation referring to Translation-Invariant Method (TI) [10]. For rotation and scaling with higher complexity, we transfer the expectation of different rotation and scaling transformations into convolution in polar space. Theoretical analysis shows that the rotation and scaling invariance can be approximately equivalent to the translation invariance in polar space. By combining our method with any gradient-based attack methods (e.g., FGSM [16], PGD [26], etc.), we can obtain adversarial examples that are more robust and transferable to affine transformation with relatively lower computational cost.

Additionally, as an enhancement of TI [10], the proposed attack further improves the input diversity, which means better transferability for defense models according to [40, 10]. Therefore, when set as the initialization for query-based black-box attacks, the proposed method can further improve the attack success rate and reduce the required queries.

Experiments on the ImageNet dataset [30] validate the effectiveness of the proposed method. Our best method improves the attack success rate by 35.5% and saves about 99% computation cost compared to EOT [3]. As a byproduct, we improve the transferability of the generated adversarial examples, with 7.5% higher success rate than the state-of-the-art transfer-based black-box attack in six defense models. Specifically, when set as the initialization for black-box attacks, our method can improve the attack success rate and greatly reduce the required queries by up to 95%.

In summary, we make the technical contributions as:

- We introduce an affine-invariant attack framework, in which we optimize the expectation of classification loss to generate adversarial examples with better robustness to affine transformation.
- We decompose affine transformation into translation and scaling-rotation transformations, and propose a kernel-based gradient estimator for them, which greatly improves the efficiency of our algorithm in generating adversarial examples.
- We provide an analysis of the gradient approximation error to ensure the rationality of our proposed algorithm.
- As an additional benefit, the affine-invariant adversarial examples can serve as a good initialization for the black-box attacks, which can improve the attack success rate and greatly reduce the queries.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the background of adversarial attacks and defenses. In Section 3, we explain how the proposed affine-invariant gradient estimator works to enhance the basic attacks. In Section 4, we give a detailed analysis of gradient approximation error. And we conduct extensive experiments and have a short discussion about the relationship between affine-invariance and transferability of adversarial examples in Section 5. Finally, we summarize the entire paper in Section 6.

2. Background

In this section, we will give a detailed description for the background of adversarial attacks and defenses. Let $x^{real}$ denote the original image, $y$ denote the ground-truth label of the corresponding $x^{real}$, and $x^{adv}$ denote an adversarial example for $x^{real}$. A classifier can be denoted as $f(x) : X \rightarrow Y$, where $x \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the input image, and $Y = \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$ is the class label with $L$ being the total number of classes. And our goal is to generate
an adversarial example $x^{adv}$, which is not visually different from the original image $x^{real}$, but can fool the classifier. Therefore, we often require the $L_p$-norm of perturbation to be smaller than a threshold $\epsilon$. And it can be expressed as $\|x^{adv} - x^{real}\|_p \leq \epsilon$, where $\epsilon$ is the budget of adversarial perturbation. Denote that $J$ is the loss function, so the goal for the untargeted attacks\footnote{In this paper, we focus on the untargeted attacks. And the attack methods can be easily extended to the targeted attacks.} is to maximize the loss $J(x^{adv}, y)$, which is expressed as

$$\arg \max_{x^{adv}} J(x^{adv}, y), \ s.t. \|x^{adv} - x^{real}\|_p \leq \epsilon. \quad (1)$$

Next, we will introduce some typical adversarial attacks and defenses.

### 2.1. White-box Attack

White-box attack can fully access the target models. One of the most important white-box attack is the gradient-based attack. FGSM [16] is a common gradient-based attack algorithm, which proves that the linear features of deep neural networks in high-dimensional space are sufficient to generate adversarial examples. It performs one-step update as

$$x^{adv} = x^{real} + \epsilon \cdot \text{sign}(\nabla_x J(x^{real}, y)), \quad (2)$$

where $\nabla_x J(x, y)$ is the gradient of the loss function with respect to $x$, $\epsilon$ is the threshold of the adversarial perturbation, and $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ is the sign function to make the perturbation meet the $L_p$ norm bound. PGD [26] extends FGSM to an iterative version. It iteratively applies gradient update with a small step size for multiple times, and clips the adversarial examples at the end of each step as

$$x^{adv}_{t+1} = \Pi_{B_p(x, \epsilon)} (x^{adv}_t + \alpha \cdot \text{sign}(\nabla_x J(x^{adv}_t, y))), \quad (3)$$

where $\nabla_x J(x, y)$ is the gradient of the loss function with respect to $x$, $\Pi$ is the projection operation, $B_p(x, \epsilon)$ is the $L_p$ ball centered at $x$ with radius $\epsilon$, and $\alpha$ is the step size.

The optimization-based attacks aim to generate the adversarial examples with minimum perturbation. Deepfool [27] is an iterative attack method based on the idea of hyper-plane classification. In each iteration, the algorithm adds a small perturbation to the image, gradually making the image cross the classification boundary, until the image is misclassified. And the final perturbation is the accumulation of perturbations for each iteration. Carlini & Wagner’s method (C&W) [6] is a powerful optimization-based method. It takes a Lagrangian form and adopts Adam [22] for optimization, which can be written as

$$\arg \min_{x^{adv}} \|x^{adv} - x^{real}\|_p - \epsilon \cdot J(x^{adv}, y). \quad (4)$$

C&W is a very effective white-box attack method, but it lacks transferability to black-box models.

### 2.2. Black-box Attack

Black-box attacks cannot access the parameters and gradients of the target model, and can generally be divided into transfer-based, scored-based and decision-based attacks.

The transfer-based attacks generate the adversarial examples with a source model, and then transfer it to the target model with the adversarial transferability [28] of the adversarial examples. MIM [9] improves the transferability by integrating a momentum term into the generation of adversarial examples. DIM [40] proposes to improve the transferability of adversarial examples by increasing the diversity of input. It applies random resizing and padding with a given probability to the inputs at each attack iteration, and feeds the outputs to the network for the gradient calculation. To further improve the transferability on some defense models, Dong et al. [10] proposed Translation-Invariant Attacks (TI). This method reduces the computational complexity by convolving the untranslated gradient maps with a predefined kernel.

Score-based attacks can only access the output scores of the target model for each input. The attacks under this setting estimate the gradient of the target model with gradient-free methods through a set of queries. NES [20] and SPSA [38] use sampling methods to completely approximate the true gradient. Prior-guided Random Gradient-free (P-RGF) [7] improves the accuracy of estimating the gradient with a transfer-based prior. NATTACK[23] learns a probability density distribution centered around the input, and samples from the distribution to generate adversarial examples.

The decision-based attacks are more challenging since the attacker can only acquire the discrete hard-label predictions of the target model. The decision-based attacks like Boundry [5] and Evolutionary [11] also play an important role in the black-box attacks.

### 2.3. Defense Methods

A large variety of adversarial defense methods have been proposed to resist the increasing threat of adversarial attacks. One of the important categories is to transform the input before feeding it to the network to reduce the influence of the adversarial perturbation, like JPEG Compression [12], Bit-depth Reduction [41], and denoising methods with auto-encoder or other generative models [24, 31]. Randomization-based defenses introduce the randomness to the networks to mitigate the effect of adversarial perturbation. And previous works mostly add randomness to the input [39] or the model [13]. Adversarial training [26, 37, 21, 42] is another popular defense methods, which expands the adversarial examples into training data to make the networks more robust against the adversarial perturbation internally. Certified defenses [29, 43] provide a certificate that guarantees the robustness of defense mod-
els under some threat models, and play an increasingly important role in defense methods.

3. Methodology

In this section, we will give a detailed description of our proposed affine-invariant gradient estimator. In Sec. 3.1, we formulate our method as maximizing the expectation of adversarial loss for affine transformation, which is decomposed into translation and scaling-rotation transformations. In Sec. 3.2, we show how to estimate the gradient of the loss function in the convolution form. In Sec. 3.3, we formulate the solution of kernel matrices in our estimator. And in Sec. 3.4, we show the attack algorithms of our method.

3.1. Problem Formulation

In order to generate more robust adversarial examples, we propose an affine-invariant attack method, which optimizes the $x^{adv}$ to maximize the expectation of adversarial loss in the preset affine transformation space domain as

$$
\arg\max_{x^{adv}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \mathcal{A}} [J(F_a(x^{adv}), y)],
$$

$$
s.t. \|x^{adv} - x^{real}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon,
$$

where $a$ is the random variable to affine transformation, $\mathcal{A}$ is the probability distribution of $a$, and $F_a(\cdot)$ is the transformation function of $a$, which returns the transformed image.

Considering subtle camera movement in a long distance, we can approximately decompose affine transformation as translation, rotation, and uniform scaling transformation, while ignoring shear and flip in our method. Therefore, for any 2-D affine transformation matrix $M_a$, we have

$$
M_a = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & m \\ 0 & 1 & n \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = M_t \cdot M_q,
$$

where $\theta$ is the rotation angle, $s$ is the scaling factor, $m$ is the translation length in x-axis, $n$ is the translation length in y-axis, $t$ and $q$ are the random variables of the decomposed translation and scaling-rotation transformation, $M_t$ and $M_q$ are the transformation matrices of $t$ and $q$. According to Eq. (6), affine transformation function $F_a(x)$ should be a composition of translation function and scaling-rotation function, which means

$$
F_a(x) = F_t(F_q(x)) = F_{t,q}(x),
$$

where $F_t$ is the translation function of $t$, and $F_q$ is the scaling-rotation function of $q$, $F_{t,q}$ is the composition function of $F_t$ and $F_q$. The decomposition process is shown in Fig. 2.

3.2. Gradient Calculation

In this section, we will provide the detailed calculation of objective gradient, which is the core of gradient-based attacks. The gradient of weighted loss to the input image $x$ can be expressed as

$$
G_{\hat{x}} = \nabla x \mathbb{E}[J(F_{t,q}(x), y)]_{x=\hat{x}}
$$

$$
= \mathbb{E}[\nabla_{x} F_{t,q}(x) J(F_{t,q}(x), y) \frac{\partial F_{t,q}(x)}{\partial x}]_{x=\hat{x}}
$$

$$
= \mathbb{E}[F_{t,q}^{-1} \nabla_{x} J(x, y)]_{x=F_{t,q}(x)},
$$

where $F_{t,q}(x)$ is replaced with $x$ in the final step.

In order to analyze the gradient to the original images, we introduce two assumptions. The first one is that $J(x, y)$ satisfies the gradient Lipschitz condition, which means smoothness to the gradient function $\nabla x J(x, y)$. The second one is that the weighted sum of the distance between the transformed images and the original one is upper-bounded. With these two assumptions, we can approximate the gradient of the transformed image with the gradient to the original one. We provide a detailed analysis of the gradient approximation error in Sec. 4. Then $G_{\hat{x}}$ can be simplified as

$$
G_{\hat{x}} \approx \mathbb{E}[F_{t,q}^{-1} \nabla_{x} J(x, y)]_{x=\hat{x}} \triangleq \hat{G}_{\hat{x}},
$$

Figure 2. In order to obtain affine invariance property, we need to calculate the expectation of gradient map obtained under different affine transformations. Affine transformation can be decomposed as translation and scaling-rotation transformations. Translation calculation can be accelerated by convolution operation referring to [10]. Scaling-rotation calculation is equivalent to convolution in corresponding polar space.
where the approximated expectation is denoted as $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_\mathbf{x}$.

For convenience of following steps, we assume that $q$ and $t$ are two independent random variables, which can be represented with detailed parameters $(s, \theta)$ and $(m, n)$ separately. Then, the gradient can be expressed as

$$
\hat{\mathcal{G}}_\mathbf{x} = E[F_{q}^{-1}(F_{t}^{-1}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} J(x, y)|_{x=\mathbf{x}}))]
= E_{(s, \theta) \sim Q}[F_{s, \theta}^{-1}(E_{(m,n) \sim \mathcal{F}}(F_{m,n}^{-1}(G_{\mathbf{x}})))]
\triangleq Q \odot \mathcal{T}(G_{\mathbf{x}}),
$$

where $q$ is split into $(s, \theta)$, $t$ is split into $(m, n)$. In final equation, we denote $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} J(x, y)|_{x=\mathbf{x}}$ as $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ and the two expectations functions as $Q$ and $\mathcal{T}$.

In actual implementation, sampling a series of transformed images for gradient calculation is a feasible but inefficient way [3]. In our method, we discrete the four random variables $(s, \theta, m, n) = \{(s_i, \theta_i, m_i, n_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ to simplify the calculation of Eq. (11). The overall framework of affine transformation decomposition and equivalence of the decomposed transformations has been shown in Fig. 2. In the following part, we provide the equivalent convolution forms.

### 3.2.1 Equivalence of Translation

Since images are discrete 2D grids, to simplify the calculation, we discretize the translation into pixel-wise shifts. And we can set the value of $q$ and $t$ are two basic directions, referring to [10], the translation transformation, we discretize the translation into pixel-wise shifts. Since images are discrete 2D grids, to simplify the calculation of Eq. (11). The overall framework of affine transformation decomposition and equivalence of the decomposed transformations has been shown in Fig. 2. In the following part, we provide the equivalent convolution forms.

### 3.2.2 Equivalence of Rotation and Scaling

For rotation and scaling, normal convolution operation does not work to simplify the calculation. However, scaling can be linearized and approximated as radial shifts in polar space, when it comes to subtle transformation. We can project the original gradient image into the polar space, which has been shown in Fig. 2. Then, rotation and scaling can be approximated as translation in the polar space. So, we replace scaling factor $s$ with radial shift distance $r$, and $Q(x)$ can be expressed as

$$
Q(x) \approx \mathcal{P}^{-1} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{P}(p(r_i, \theta_j)F_{r_i, \theta_j}^{-1}(x))
\iff \mathcal{P}^{-1} \sum_{i,j} p'(u_i, v_j)F_{u_i, v_j}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}(x)),
$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{-1}(\cdot)$ are the polar transformation and inverse polar transformation, $u$ and $v$ are the corresponding random variables in polar space. The same as the translation part, by discretizing the translation in polar space into pixel-wise shifts, we can get

$$
Q(x) \iff \mathcal{P}^{-1} \left( \Lambda'_q \ast \mathcal{P}(x) \right),
$$

where $\Lambda'_q$ is the translation kernel matrix of size $(2l_1 + 1) \times (2l_2 + 1)$ in polar space.

Finally, the total gradient calculation can be equivalent to some simple operations as

$$
G_{\mathbf{x}} \approx \hat{\mathcal{G}}_\mathbf{x} \iff \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\Lambda'_q \ast \mathcal{P}(\Lambda_t \ast G_{\mathbf{x}})),
$$

where $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ is first convolved with a translation kernel $\Lambda_t$, then convolved with another translation kernel $\Lambda'_q$ in polar space.

### 3.3. Kernel Matrix

For the kernel part, we set the translation step size in a limited range, with $m \in \{-k_1, \cdots, 0, \cdots, k_1\}$ and $n \in \{-k_2, \cdots, 0, \cdots, k_2\}$. To ensure the robustness to untransformed images, we follow the basic principle that the more the input image changes, the lower weight should be assigned. Therefore, we empirically set $\tilde{\Lambda}_t$ to be a Gaussian kernel, i.e.

$$
\tilde{\Lambda}_{m,n} = (2\pi\sigma_{t_1}\sigma_{t_2})^{-1}\exp\left(-\frac{(m^2 + n^2)}{(2\sigma_{t_1}\sigma_{t_2})^{-1}}\right), \quad \sigma_{t_1} = k_1\sqrt{3} \text{ and } \sigma_{t_2} = k_2/\sqrt{3}.
$$

To ensure that the convolved gradients is at the same level as the original ones, we need to set $\Lambda_t$ as a normalized matrix:

$$
\Lambda_t = \tilde{\Lambda}_t/\|\tilde{\Lambda}_t\|_1.
$$

As for rotation and scaling part, we can define the kernel matrix directly in the polar space just like the translation part. Following the same principle, we set $\tilde{\Lambda}_{q_{i,j}} = (2\pi\sigma_u\sigma_v)^{-1}\exp\left(-l_i^2 + l_j^2\right)(2\sigma_u\sigma_v)^{-1}$, where $i \in \{-l_1, \cdots, 0, \cdots, l_1\}$, $j \in \{-l_2, \cdots, 0, \cdots, l_2\}$ and $\sigma_u = l_1/\sqrt{3}$, $\sigma_v = l_2/\sqrt{3}$. Then the kernel is defined as

$$
\Lambda'_q = \tilde{\Lambda}'_q/\|\tilde{\Lambda}'_q\|_1.
$$

The normalized convolution kernels $\Lambda'_q$ in Eq. (16) and $\Lambda_t$ in Eq. (17) are used to enhance the affine invariance of the gradient map.
3.4. Attack Algorithms

In Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3, we have shown how to calculate the gradient and corresponding kernel matrix. Here, we will introduce the updating strategy of our attack method for generating adversarial examples. Essentially, our method is also related to the gradient, so it can be easily integrated into other gradient-based attack methods introduced in Sec. 2, such as FGSM [16], PGD [26], etc. For the gradient-based attack methods like PGD, we need to calculate the gradient $\nabla_x J(x_{adv}^t, y)$ of the current solution $x_{adv}^t$ in each step. And in our method, we just need to replace the normal gradient with the result of $G_\alpha$ obtained by our proposed affine-invariant gradient estimator in Sec. 3.2.

For example, when combined with one-step methods like the FGSM [16] (AI-FGSM), the updating strategy is written as

$$x_{adv} = x_{real} + \epsilon \cdot \text{sign}(G_{x_{real}}). \quad (18)$$

And when combined with the iterative methods like PGD [26] (AI-PGD), the updating strategy can be written as

$$x_{adv}^{t+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_p(x, \epsilon)} \left( x_{adv}^t + \alpha \cdot \text{sign}(G_{x_{adv}^t}) \right). \quad (19)$$

The detailed algorithm of AI-PGD is summarized in Algorithm 1. And our method can be similarly integrated into other gradient-based attack methods like MIM [9] and DIM [40] as AI-MIM and AI-DIM.

4. Analysis of Gradient Approximation Error

In Sec. 3.2, we have introduced a gradient approximation to simplify the gradient calculation in Eq. (10) as

$$\mathbb{E}[F_{t, q}^{-1} (\nabla_x J(x, y) \big|_{x = \hat{x}})] \approx \mathbb{E}[F_{t, q}^{-1} (\nabla_x J(x, y) \big|_{x = x})]. \quad (20)$$

In this section, we will give a detailed analysis of the gradient approximation error to show the rationality of using gradient approximation in our method.

We let $g_1 = \mathbb{E}[F_{t, q}^{-1} (\nabla_x J(x, y) \big|_{x = \hat{x}})]$ and $g_2 = \mathbb{E}[F_{t, q}^{-1} (\nabla_x J(x, y) \big|_{x = \hat{x}})]$ for convenience. And we will first introduce the two main assumptions used in our analysis.

CNNs introduce ReLU activation function into the structure, so the loss function $J(x, y)$ of the neural networks does not satisfy the Lipschitz condition. However, recent studies [2, 15] have shown that the optimization landscape is almost-convex and semi-smooth with over-parameterized neural networks, showing the semi-smoothness of the loss function. Then we can strengthen this conclusion into the first assumption.

**Assumption 1.** The loss function $J(x, y)$ satisfies the gradient Lipschitz condition, which means smoothness to the gradient function $\nabla_x J(x, y)$. And subtle affine transformation will not affect its smoothness, which can be expressed as

$$\left\| F_{t, q}^{-1} (\nabla_x J(x_2, y)) - F_{t, q}^{-1} (\nabla_x J(x_1, y)) \right\|_2 \leq c_1 \|x_2 - x_1\|_2,$$

where $c_1$ is a positive constant.

For natural images, the values of two adjacent pixels are usually continuous and gradual. Therefore, when the affine transformation we perform on the image is smaller, the Euclidean distance between the transformed image and the original image is also smaller. Then we can lay out our second assumption.

**Assumption 2.** The expectation of the distance between the affine transformed image and the original one is upper-bounded as

$$\mathbb{E}[\|F_{t, q}(\hat{x}) - x\|_2] \leq c_2,$$

where $c_2$ is a positive constant.

With the two assumptions, we can get the Corollary 1 that the Euclidean distance between $g_1$ and $g_2$ is upper-bounded. The detailed proof is shown in Appendix A.

**Corollary 1.** The Euclidean distance between $g_1$ and $g_2$ is upper-bounded as

$$\|g_2 - g_1\|_2 \leq c_1 \cdot c_2.$$
Besides, the generation process of adversarial examples indicates that the gradients $g_1$ and $g_2$ cannot be zero. Then we can set a lower bound to the norm of $g_1$ and $g_2$, which can be expressed as 
\[ \|g_1\|_2 \geq c_3; \quad \|g_2\|_2 \geq c_3, \] (24)
where $c_3$ is a positive constant. Then we can analyze the difference of directions between $g_1$ and $g_2$ by their cosine similarity. And we finally give the following corollary about their cosine similarity. The detailed proof is shown in Appendix A.

**Corollary 2.** The cosine similarity of $g_1$ and $g_2$ is lower-bounded as
\[ \text{cossim}(g_1, g_2) \geq 1 - \frac{(c_1 c_2)^2}{2c_3^2}, \] (25)
where $\text{cossim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the cosine similarity function.

In our method, we finally use Gaussian kernels, which can cause a relatively small $c_2$. Then with Corollary 1 and Corollary 2, we can approximate the gradient calculation as Eq. (20) with a small lower-bound approximation error.

## 5. Experiments

In this section, we introduce our experiments and prove the effectiveness of our method. In Sec. 5.1, we introduce the experimental settings. And we then test the affine-invariance and efficiency of our methods compared to some basic attacks and EOT[3] in Sec. 5.2. In Sec. 5.3, we verify the robustness of our methods to defense models under black-box settings. Then, we have an ablation study for our methods in Sec. 5.4. Finally, we have a short discussion about the affine-invariance and transferability of adversarial examples in Sec. 5.5.

### 5.1. Experimental Settings

#### Dataset and Models

We use an ImageNet-compatible dataset comprised of 1,000 images, which was used in the NIPS 2017 adversarial competition. For models, we choose four naturally trained models and six defense models according to RealSafe platform [8]. These models are naturally trained Inception v3 (Inc-v3) [35], Inception v4 (Inc-v4) [34], Inception ResNet v2 (IncRes-v2) [34], and ResNet v2-152 (Res-v2-152) [19], Ensemble Adversarial Training (Ens-AT) [37], Adversarial Logit Pairing (ALP) [21], JPEG Compression [12], Bit-depth Reduction (Bit-Red) [41], Random Resizing andPadding (R&P) [39], and RandMix [43]. And we use Inc-v3 as the backbone model for defenses based on input transformations such as:

\[\text{https://github.com/cleverhans-lab/cleverhans/tree/master/cleverhans_v3.1.0/examples/nips17_adversarial_competition/dataset} \]
Figure 3. The ASRs (%) of adversarial attacks against Inc-v3 under different rotation and scaling. The adversarial examples are generated for Inc-v3 using PGD and AI-PGD. Fig. (a) shows the results in the form of 3D figure. Fig. (b) shows four randomly selected profiles of Fig. (a), which are $s = 1.0$, $s = 1.2$, $\theta = 10^\circ$ and $\theta = 20^\circ$.

Figure 4. The ASRs (%) of adversarial attacks against Inc-v3 under different rotation and scaling. The adversarial examples are generated for Inc-v3 using DIM and AI-DIM. Fig. (a) shows the results in the form of 3D figure. Fig. (b) shows four randomly selected profiles of Fig. (a), which are $s = 0.6$, $s = 0.8$, $\theta = -30^\circ$ and $\theta = -15^\circ$.

JPEG and Bit-Red.

**Evaluation Metrics.** We use the attack success rate as the evaluation metrics referring to RealSafe [8]. And the attack success rate of an untargeted attack on the classifier $f$ can be defined as

$$\text{ASR}(A_{\epsilon,p},f) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{N} 1(f(x_i) = y_i \land f(A_{\epsilon,p}(x_i)) \neq y_i),$$

where $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^{N}$ is the test set, $1(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, $A_{\epsilon,p}$ means the attack method that generates the adversarial examples with perturbation budget $\epsilon$ under the $L_p$ norm, and $M = \sum_{i=1}^{N} 1(f(x_i) = y_i)$.

**Hyper-parameters.** We set the maximum perturbation to be $\epsilon = 16$ with pixel value $\in [0,255]$. For all iterative methods, we set the number of iteration steps to be 10. For methods related to DIM [40], we use the decay factor $\mu = 1.0$. And for EOT [3], the number of samples and optimization steps are both set to be 50. In order to avoid influencing the performance of the attacks on untransformed images, we only consider affine transformations within a narrow range, with $\theta \in [-30^\circ, 30^\circ]$, $s \in [0.5, 1.5]$, $m, n \in [-20, 20]$. Then we set the kernel...
size of $\Lambda_t$, $A_q'$ to $(15 \times 15)$ and $(15 \times 15)$.

5.2. Robustness to Affine Transformation

In this section, we show the experimental results of the proposed affine-invariant method over different affine transformations. We have selected FGSM, PGD, MIM and DIM as the basic attacks, and their extensions combined with our method are named with an "AI-" prefix. EOT is also considered as a baseline of transform-based attacks. We choose Inc-v3 as the white-box model, and test their performance on Inc-v3 (white-box model), Inc-v4 (black-box model) and Ens-AT (defense model), respectively. We separately study the ASRs to three kinds of transformations: rotation, scaling and translation.

5.2.1 Rotation

As to rotation, we set $s = 1$, $m = 0$, $n = 0$ and the rotation angle to be $\theta \in [-30^\circ, 30^\circ]$ at a step of $15^\circ$ to see the performance of different methods under different angles. We report the test results in Tab. 1. In total, the ASRs have increased a lot with the proposed method added to the basic models. Results on black-box models and defense models also demonstrate that our method are more transferable and resistant to defenses. In particular, our method brings the greatest improvement to PGD, which increases the ASR by 27% in average. And our best attack AI-DIM outperforms the EOT with a large margin, especially for black-box and defense models. For example, it improves the ASR by 57% for defense model compared to EOT. The results confirm the effectiveness of the specifically designed rotation-invariant kernel.

5.2.2 Scaling

As to scaling, we have done a stress test to verify the stability of our method. We set the rotation angle and translation offsets in an extreme condition as $\theta = 30^\circ$, $m = 20$, $n = 20$, and set the scaling factor as $s \in [0.5, 0.7, 1.0, 1.3, 1.5]$ to show the performance under different scales. From the results in Tab. 2, we observe that our method still maintains better affine invariance under extreme affine transformation, showing huge performance gains compared with the basic attacks and EOT. Taking $s = 0.5$ in white-box attacks as an example, our method improves the ASRs by 15.3%, 43.3%, 20.7% and 19.3% for FGSM, PGD, MIM and DIM, and the best attack AI-DIM brings a 47.4% performance gain compared to EOT. This demonstrates that our method improves the robustness to large-scale affine transformations. The results also prove that the kernel we designed in the polar space is effective for achieving scaling invariance.

Table 3. The ASRs (%) of adversarial attacks under different translation. The adversarial examples are crafted for Inc-v3 using the following nine attacks. We set $\theta = 30^\circ$ and $s = 0.7$, and test the performance on Inc-v3, Inc-v4 and Ens-AT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Inc-v3</th>
<th>Inc-v4</th>
<th>Ens-AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSM</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-FGSM</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-PGD</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-MIM</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-DIM</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOT</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The average ASRs (%) of AI-DIM and EOT and the cost of time(s) to generate 1000 adversarial examples. The adversarial examples are crafted for Inc-v3 using the following two attacks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Avg ASRs(%)</th>
<th>Avg Time(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inc-v3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc-v4</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>56580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ens-AT</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Translation

As to translation, we randomly set the rotation angle and scaling factor as $\theta = 30^\circ$, $s = 0.7$. Due to the symmetry of translation, the translation offsets are set to positive numbers as $(m, n) \in [(5, 5), (20, 20)]$. From the results in Tab. 3, we find that different translation offsets have little effect on the attack performance. Nevertheless, our method still performs better than the basic attacks and EOT, which demonstrates that the translation kernel we construct referring to [10] also has a good estimation of the gradient.

In summary, our best attack, AI-DIM, achieves an average ASR of 94.0% for white-box model, 87.1% for black-box model and 69.5% for defense model over the tested affine transformation domain. In order to further show the margin improved by our method, taking AI-PGD and AI-DIM as the examples, we visualize the white-box attack success rate function with rotation angle and scaling factor as independent variables in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. More results can be found in Appendix B. We set the translation offsets both as 0, since they have little effect on the performance. Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show that our method keeps a relatively high attack success rate even under extreme affine transformation, showing better affine invariance than the basic attacks. In addition, we compare the efficiency of our method with EOT in Tab. 4. And the experiment is conducted on a GTX 1080TI GPU. From the results, we conclude that our best method improves the attack success rate by 35.5% and saves about 99% computation cost compared to EOT.

We also visualize the adversarial images generated for the Inc-v3 model by PGD, AI-PGD, DIM and AI-DIM with
different transformations in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively. More adversarial images generated by FGSM, MIM and their corresponding combinations with our method will be shown in Appendix C. Due to transformation to polar space, we can see that the adversarial perturbations generated by our affine-invariant attacks exhibit circular patterns. Besides, the adversarial perturbations generated by our affine-invariant attacks are smoother than those generated by PGD and DIM, which is caused by smooth effect of kernel convolution. We further show the predicted labels and probabilities for the images with different affine transformation, and the results show the adversarial examples generated by our method are more robust to the affine transformation.

5.3. Robustness to Defense Models under Black-box Setting

TI [10] has shown that it can improve the transferability of adversarial examples greatly to the defense models. As shown in Sec. 3, the proposed affine-invariant method is an enhancement of TI method. Therefore, we conduct an experiment to show the transferability of adversarial examples generated by different attacks against defense models. We test the performance of single-model attacks and ensemble-based attacks [9], respectively. For single-model attacks, we set IncRes-v2 as the surrogate model to generate adversarial examples. As to ensemble-based attacks, we attack the ensemble of Inc-v4, IncRes-v2, and Res-v2-152 with equal ensemble weights. And we choose six state-of-the-art defense models according to RealSafe [8].

From Tab. 5, we can see that, compared with TI method and basic attacks, our method has a significant improvement for tested defense models. In particular, combined with PGD, MIM and DIM, our method improves the ASRs by 17.1\%, 6.2\%, 5.1\% on average for ensemble-based attacks than TI method. It demonstrates that the proposed affine-invariant attacks can better improve the transferability of the generated adversarial examples to evade the defense models. The major reason is that our method considers a wider transformation domain, and can generate adversarial examples that are less sensitive to the discriminative regions of white-box model, which helps to evade the defense models [10].

To further verify the transferability, we set our method as the initialization of some scored-based black-box attacks, and compare its performance with PGD, TI and the original attacks. We choose NES [20], SPSA [38] and AT/ATTACK [23] as the score-based black-box attacks,EnsAT, ALP, JPEG, Bit-Red, R&P and RandMix as the defense...
Table 5. The ASRs (%) of adversarial attacks against six defense models. The adversarial examples for single-model attacks and ensemble-based attacks are crafted for IncRes-v2 and the ensemble of Inc-v4, IncRes-v2, and Res-v2-152, respectively, using FGSM, PGD, MIM, DIM and their TI and AI extensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Single-model attacks</th>
<th>Ensemble-based attacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGSM</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-FGSM</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-FGSM</td>
<td><strong>31.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-PGD</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-PGD</td>
<td><strong>31.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-MIM</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-MIM</td>
<td><strong>49.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-DIM</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-DIM</td>
<td><strong>62.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The ASRs (%) and average queries of score-based attacks with different initialization. The surrogate models for the initialization are the ensemble of Inc-v4, IncRes-v2 and Res-v2-15. And the selected defense models are Ens-AT, ALP, JPEG, Bit-Red, R&P and RandMix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Ens-AT</th>
<th>ALP</th>
<th>JEPG</th>
<th>Bit-Red</th>
<th>R&amp;P</th>
<th>RandMix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGSM</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>6126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-FGSM</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-FGSM</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>6001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-PGD</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-PGD</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-MIM</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI-MIM</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. Ablation Study

In this part, we delve into the proposed affine-invariant gradient estimator to explore the effect of each component. Overall, our proposed affine-invariant attack can be regarded as an enhancement of the basic attack and TI attack. From the experimental results in Sec. 5.2 and Sec. 5.3, the affine-invariant gradient estimator can undoubtedly improve the affine invariance and black-box ASRs to defense models of the generated adversarial examples. Delving into detailed components, we then focus on the effect of convolutional kernel type and size.

5.4.1 Kernel Type

In order to verify the principle we have adopted that the more the input image changes, the lower weight it should be assigned, we design another Uniform kernel to compare with Gaussian kernel, which means we set the same weight for each transformed images. Tab. 7 shows the performance of AI-DIM under five random selected affine transformations to one white-box model, one black-box model and six defense models. From the results, we can see that, except for very few defense models, the Gaussian kernel performs better on most models. The results also confirm our analysis in the Sec. 4.

5.4.2 Kernel Size

We set the kernel type as Gaussian kernel, and further investigate the effect of kernel size. To ensure the simplicity of the experiment, we keep the size of the two kernels to be equal. Fig. 7 shows the results obtained under the same experimental settings as the experiment concerning kernel type. From the results, we find the attack success rates are positive correlated to the kernel size at first, but gradually...
transferability on the affine transformation. Then we refer
type of affine invariance can actually be regarded as the
setting and others as the black-box setting. Therefore, this
use of the gradients of untransformed images, instead of the
box transferability of adversarial examples are two com-
5.5. Discussion
From traditional perspective, affine invariance and black-
box transferability of adversarial examples are two com-
pletely unrelated concepts. In our method, we only make
use of the gradients of untransformed images, instead of the
other transformed ones. Considering the affine transforma-
tion module as a part of the target model, we can regard
the situation without affine transformation as the white-box
setting and others as the black-box setting. Therefore, this
type of affine invariance can actually be regarded as the
transferability on the affine transformation. Then we refer
to these two transferability collectively as the generalization
transferability, which means the generalization and robust-
ness of adversarial attacks when facing unknown environ-
ments. Back to our method, the proposed affine-invariant
attacks improve not only the transferability over black-box
models, but also that over affine transformation. Therefore,
we declare that the affine-invariant attacks further enhance
the generalized transferability of the adversarial examples.

6. Conclusion
In this paper, we proposed an affine-invariant attack
method to improve affine-invariance and transferability of the
adversarial examples. Our method optimizes the ad-
versarial perturbations by a gradient estimator, which pro-
vides an approximation of the affine-invariant gradient and
is accelerated with convolution operations. And we further
carried an analysis of the gradient approximation error.
Our method can be integrated into any gradient-based at-

Table 7. The ASRs (%) of AI-DIM with two different kernel types under five random selected affine transformation to one white-box model (Inc-V3), one black-box model (Inc-V4) and six defense models (Ens-AT, ALP, JPEG, Bit-Red, R&P and RandMix). And The adversarial examples are crafted for Inc-V3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation Sample</th>
<th>Inc-v3</th>
<th>Inc-v4</th>
<th>Ens-AT</th>
<th>ALP</th>
<th>JPEG</th>
<th>Bit-Red</th>
<th>R&amp;P</th>
<th>RandMix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(θ, s, m, n) = (0°, 1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(θ, s, m, n) = (15°, 1, 2, 5)</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(θ, s, m, n) = (30°, 1.5, 20, 20)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(θ, s, m, n) = (−10°, 0.7, 5)</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(θ, s, m, n) = (−20°, 0.5, 20, 20)</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. The ASRs (%) of AI-DIM with different kernel sizes ranging from 1 to 31 under five random selected affine transformation to one white-box model (Inc-V3), one black-box model (Inc-V4) and six defense models (Ens-AT, ALP, JPEG, Bit-Red, R&P and RandMix). And The adversarial examples are crafted for Inc-V3.

tend to be stable or even descend after the kernel size reach-
ing 15. Nevertheless, there exist some models like Ens-AT
on which the attack success rates keep increasing when the
kernel size increases. In general, our method performs bet-
ter when the kernel size is around 15. Therefore, the kernel
size is also set to be 15 × 15 in our main experiments.

5.5. Discussion
From traditional perspective, affine invariance and black-
box transferability of adversarial examples are two com-
pletely unrelated concepts. In our method, we only make
use of the gradients of untransformed images, instead of the
other transformed ones. Considering the affine transforma-
tion module as a part of the target model, we can regard
the situation without affine transformation as the white-box
setting and others as the black-box setting. Therefore, this
type of affine invariance can actually be regarded as the
transferability on the affine transformation. Then we refer
tack methods. We conducted extensive experiments to validate the effectiveness of the proposed method. Our best attack, AI-DIM, achieves an average success rate of 94.0% for white-box model, 87.1% for the black-box model and 69.5% for defense model under the tested affine transformations. Compared with EOT, it obtains 30% higher ASR with only about 1% computation cost. Besides, our method improves the success rate by an average of 9.5% over the state-of-the-art transfer-based black-box attack on six defense models. And the best method reduces the number of queries by up to 95% for the tested score-based black-box attack.
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Proof.\[\|g_2 - g_1\|_2 \leq c_1 \cdot c_2.\] (27)

\[\|g_2 - g_1\|_2 = \|E[\mathcal{F}_{t,q}^{-1}(\nabla_x J(x, y)|_{x=\hat{x}}) - \mathcal{F}_{t,q}^{-1}(\nabla_x J(x, y)|_{x=x})]\|_2 \\
\leq E\|\mathcal{F}_{t,q}^{-1}(\nabla_x J(x, y)|_{x=\hat{x}}) - \mathcal{F}_{t,q}^{-1}(\nabla_x J(x, y)|_{x=x})\|_2 \\
\leq c_1 \cdot E\|\mathcal{F}_{t,q}(\hat{x}) - \hat{x}\|_2 \\
\leq c_1 \cdot c_2.\] (28)

Corollary 1. The Euclidean distance between \(g_1\) and \(g_2\) is upper-bounded as

\[cossim(g_1, g_2) \geq 1 - \frac{(c_1 c_2)^2}{2c_3^2},\] (29)

where \(cossim(\cdot, \cdot)\) is the cosine similarity function.

Proof. We first denote the normalized gradients as \(\tilde{g}_1 = \frac{g_1}{\|g_1\|_2}\) and \(\tilde{g}_2 = \frac{g_2}{\|g_2\|_2}\). From the definition of cosine similarity, we have

\[cossim(g_1, g_2) = \frac{g_1 \cdot g_2}{\|g_1\|_2 \|g_2\|_2} = 1 - \frac{\|\tilde{g}_2 - \tilde{g}_1\|_2^2}{2}.\] (30)

With Eq. (24) in Sec. 4, we assume \(\|g_2\|_2 \geq \|g_1\|_2 \geq c_3\). Then we have

\[\|g_2 - \tilde{g}_1\|_2^2 = \|g_2\|_2^2 - \frac{g_1 \cdot g_2}{\|g_1\|_2} + \frac{g_1 \cdot g_2}{\|g_2\|_2} - \frac{g_1 \cdot g_2}{\|g_1\|_2} \]
\[\leq \frac{1}{c_3^2} \cdot \|g_2 - g_1\|_2^2.\] (31)

And we can get the similar corollary for the case of \(\|g_1\|_2 \geq \|g_2\|_2 \geq c_3\). Therefore, we finally have

\[cossim(g_1, g_2) = 1 - \frac{\|g_2 - g_1\|_2^2}{2} \]
\[\geq 1 - \frac{1}{2c_3^2} \cdot \|g_2 - g_1\|_2^2 \] (32)
\[\geq 1 - \frac{(c_1 c_2)^2}{2c_3^2}.\]

\[\Box\]

B. Full Results For the Robustness to Affine Transformation

In this section, we further visualize the white-box attack success rate function with rotation angle and scaling factor as independent variables for FGSM, AI-FGSM, and MIM, AI-MIM. The results are shown in Fig. 8 for FGSM and AI-FGSM, and Fig. 9 for MIM and AI-MIM. The results show that our method also greatly improves the attack success rate under different affine transformations, compared with the other two basic attack methods.

C. Full Visualization Results for transformed examples

In this section, we further show the adversarial images generated for the Inc-v3 model by FGSM, MIM and their extension AI-FGSM, AI-MIM with different affine transformations. We present the visualization results of FGSM and AI-FGSM in Fig. 10, and MIM and AI-MIM in Fig. 11.
Figure 8. The ASRs (%) of adversarial attacks against Inc-v3 under different rotation and scaling. The adversarial examples are generated for Inc-v3 using FGSM and AI-FGSM. Fig. (a) shows the results in the form of 3D figure. Fig. (b) shows four randomly selected profiles of Fig. (a), which are $s = 0.5$, $s = 0.7$, $\theta = 10^\circ$ and $\theta = 20^\circ$.

Figure 9. The ASRs (%) of adversarial attacks against Inc-v3 under different rotation and scaling. The adversarial examples are generated for Inc-v3 using MIM and AI-MIM. Fig. (a) shows the results in the form of 3D figure. Fig. (b) shows four randomly selected profiles of Fig. (a), which are $s = 1.1$, $s = 1.5$, $\theta = 0^\circ$ and $\theta = 15^\circ$. 
Figure 10. The adversarial examples are generated for Inc-v3 by FGSM and AI-FGSM with different transformations, including untransformed, rotation with $\theta = 30^\circ$, scaling with $s = 1.5$, and mix transformation. The mix transformation consists of $\theta = 30^\circ$, $s = 1.5$ and translation offsets $t = (20, 20)$. In the pictures, red represents a successful attack, and green represents a failed attack.

Figure 11. The adversarial examples are generated for Inc-v3 by MIM and AI-MIM with different transformations, including untransformed, rotation with $\theta = 30^\circ$, scaling with $s = 1.5$, and mix transformation. The mix transformation consists of $\theta = 30^\circ$, $s = 1.5$ and translation offsets $t = (20, 20)$. In the pictures, red represents a successful attack, and green represents a failed attack.