

MaskBlock: Transferable Adversarial Examples with Bayes Approach

Mingyuan Fan,¹ Cen Chen,² Ximeng Liu¹ Wenzhong Gu¹

¹ the College of Computer and Data Science, Fuzhou University

² the School of Data Science and Engineering, East China Normal University

fmy2660966@gmail.com, cenchen@dase.ecnu.edu.cn, snbnix@gmail.com, guowenzhong@fzu.edu.cn

Abstract

The transferability of adversarial examples (AEs) across diverse models is of critical importance for black-box adversarial attacks, where attackers cannot access the information about black-box models. However, crafted AEs always present poor transferability. In this paper, by regarding the transferability of AEs as generalization ability of the model, we reveal that vanilla black-box attacks craft AEs via solving a maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) problem. For MLE, the results probably are model-specific local optimum when available data is small, i.e., limiting the transferability of AEs. By contrast, we re-formulate crafting transferable AEs as the maximizing a posteriori probability estimation problem, which is an effective approach to boost the generalization of results with limited available data. Because Bayes posterior inference is commonly intractable, a simple yet effective method called MaskBlock is developed to approximately estimate. Moreover, we show that the formulated framework is a generalization version for various attack methods. Extensive experiments illustrate MaskBlock can significantly improve the transferability of crafted adversarial examples by up to about 20%.

Introduction

Deep neural networks (DNNs) have obtained extraordinary achievements in a broad spectrum of areas (Al-Saffar, Tao, and Talab 2017; Torfi et al. 2020; Batmaz et al. 2019), but many works reveal that DNNs are extremely vulnerable to adversarial attacks (Shukla et al. 2021; Mao et al. 2021). Specifically, adversarial attacks can easily fool DNNs by employing adversarial examples (AEs), generated by imposing slight carefully crafted noises into natural examples. The vulnerability of DNNs poses a significant hindrance to deploying DNNs in diverse scenarios, particularly in safety-critical settings such as autonomous driving. Therefore, exposing as many blind spots of DNNs as possible is a top priority and developing effective adversarial attacks, consequently, has become a fundamental task in the AI security area.

Although many inspiring white-box attack methods are developed over past years, the effectiveness of such attack methods heavily builds upon the white-box scenario (Goodfellow, Shlens, and Szegedy 2014; Kurakin, Goodfellow,

and Bengio 2016; Madry et al. 2017), where attackers are allowed to access complete knowledge of the remote target model, e.g., gradients for input. However, deployed black-box models are commonly opaque to unauthorized users. Hence, launching adversarial attacks in the black-box scenario is more challenging and practical, since black-box scenario assumes that only the outputs of the target model are available.

There are two types of black-box attacks: query-based attacks (Shukla et al. 2021; Yan et al. 2020; Croce and Hein 2020) and transfer-based attacks (Dong et al. 2018, 2019). Typically, query-based attacks (Shukla et al. 2021; Croce and Hein 2020) need an avalanche of queries to the target model for approximately estimating the information required (input gradient). However, this resource-intensive query budget is costly and inevitably alerts the model owner, significantly limiting their applicability. Unlike query-based attacks, transfer-based attacks exploit an intriguing property of adversarial examples, i.e., transferability that enables AEs to transfer across models with different architectures and parameters. Therefore, attackers can effectively launch black-box attacks by crafting transferable AEs via an accessible white-box proxy model, without interactions with the remote black-box model.

The performance of transfer-based attacks largely relies on the transferability of crafted AEs, while, unfortunately, the AEs present poor transferability (Wu et al. 2018), imposing a major constraint for transfer-based attacks. Hence, a lot of efforts have been concentrated on enhancing the transferability of AEs. Most existing works (Xie et al. 2019; Lin et al. 2020; Dong et al. 2019) focused on crafting transferable AEs are developed intuitively or empirically without solid explanations. For instance, diverse inputs attack (Xie et al. 2019), a famous attack in this area, increases the transferability of AEs by resizing and padding the inputs. Despite the effectiveness of the method being presented in practice, the underlying principle behind it is still unknown, confusing researchers so far. In other words, there is a lot of interest in theoretical analysis, as it can reveal the mechanism of these methods and then guide the design of powerful attack methods. Thus, the lack of solid theoretical analysis becomes the main bottleneck in this area. Under such context, a key challenge arises: why do these attacks work? Is there a universal principle behind these methods? If the principle

exists, can we do better based on the principle?

This paper aims at the ambitious goal of solving the above-mentioned questions and achieving the following breakthroughs. Firstly, based on the insight that the transferability of AEs is equivalent to the generalized ability of models (Lin et al. 2020), the existing methods can be categorized into three classes: data-based, optimization-based, and regularization-based methods. Wherein, the principle of the former two classes is straightforward but the principle of the third class is difficult to investigate. Interestingly, we discover that vanilla transfer-based attacks can be formulated as a maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) task. Furthermore, with rarely observed data, the results of MLE commonly generalize badly in unseen data (Bolstad and Curran 2016), i.e., less transferable across unknown target models. By contrast, Bayes approach is known as an effective technique to make more robust estimation results, particularly with limited data (Bolstad and Curran 2016) and, inspired by it, we employ Bayes approach to craft adversarial examples, such that the resultant AEs are more transferable across black-box models. However, for Bayes approach, an intractable posterior inference problem is required to be solved (Zhang et al. 2018). To overcome this problem, we exploit a variational distribution to substitute the posterior distribution and propose a simple yet effective method called MaskBlock to sample data from the variational distribution for executing unbiased Monte Carlo estimation. Moreover, we present that all regularization-based methods are special cases defined by a certain sampling method similar to MaskBlock, thereby the effectiveness of such methods can be understood with Bayes approach. Finally, it has to be highlighted that such sampling (regularization-based) methods can be ensembled to obtain a better approximation to ground-truth distribution for crafting transferable AEs with high transferability. Extensive experiments on benchmark dataset ImageNet show that MaskBlock significantly improves the attack effectiveness against both normal and secured models by a large margin. Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- We formulate the crafting transferable adversarial examples as a posterior inference problem and we also show that it is a generalization framework for various black-box attack methods.
- We propose a simple yet effective sampling method called MaskBlock to execute unbiased Monte Carlo estimation, so as to approximately solve the intractable posterior inference problem in Bayes approach.
- We conduct extensive experiments on the benchmark dataset ImageNet to verify the effectiveness of the proposed method MaskBlock, in which MaskBlock is compatible with various attacks and can produce great benefits to these attacks, i.e., more transferable adversarial examples.

Related Works

Adversarial attacks impose human-imperceptible noises into natural samples to fool the target model and can be roughly categorized in two types: white-box attacks and black-box attacks. White-box attacks assume that the attackers have

full knowledge about the structure and parameters of the target model; in contrast, attackers are not allowed to access any information about the target model in the black-box scenario.

White-box Attacks. In the white-box scenario, attacks commonly add the sign of input gradient into inputs to craft adversarial examples. For example, fast gradient sign method (FGSM) (Goodfellow, Shlens, and Szegedy 2014) implements the idea for one time, and its iterative version, basic iterative method (BIM) (Kurakin, Goodfellow, and Bengio 2016), executes the process multiple times. The other variant of BIM includes projected gradient descent (PGD) (Madry et al. 2017), which adds small random noises into initial adversarial noises to evade the bad initial points. Despite these attack methods being designed for white-box attacks, they are commonly adopted as a backend component for transfer-based black-box attacks.

Black-box Attacks. In the black-box scenario, there are two ways to conduct attacks: query-based attacks and transfer-based attacks. We mainly give a brief review of transfer-based attacks, as this paper focuses on exploring the transferability of adversarial examples. Attackers in this scenario commonly train a proxy model and then use the proxy model to produce adversarial examples with white-box adversarial attack methods, such as BIM. However, the produced adversarial examples with these pure white-box attacks were quite ineffective for unknown target models. Several methods (Dong et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2018; Xie et al. 2019; Lin et al. 2020; Dong et al. 2019) have been proposed to enable more powerful black-box attacks by enhancing the cross-model transferability of adversarial examples. For example, some optimization techniques used to improve the generalization ability of the models had been proposed to increase the transferability of adversarial examples. The classic momentum iterative attack (MI) (Dong et al. 2018) adopted momentum iterative optimization method, which stabilizes the updating direction by using previously accumulated gradients. Similarly to it, variance tuning (VT) (Wang and He 2021) attempted to tune the gradient by gradient variance. Intermediate Level Attack (ILA) (Huang et al. 2019) crafted transferable adversarial examples by deleting the later layers of the proxy model, where ILA assumes that shallow layers are shared over different models and the latter layers introduce the specific-model factors into crafted adversarial examples. Skip gradient method (SG) (Wu et al. 2020) also followed this hypothesis and added a decay factor in residual layers to reduce influences from the later layers. Besides, (Wu et al. 2018; Xie et al. 2019; Lin et al. 2020; Dong et al. 2019) suggested to replace the gradient calculations in white-box attacks with the average gradients of a group of augmented images. However, the principle behind these methods is rarely, or difficultly, explored and this paper attempts to face the challenge.

Approach

Understanding Transferable Adversarial Examples

Essentially, crafting adversarial examples is an optimization problem similar to training DNNs. In detail, in the process

of training DNNs, the primary objective is to search a group of suitable parameters for model so that the trained model can perform well on both seen data and unseen data; in the context of transfer-based adversarial attacks, the overarching goal is producing adversarial examples transferred across diverse black-box models. Based on the above insights, the transferability of adversarial examples can be naturally akin to the generalization ability of the model (Lin et al. 2020). Therefore, the technologies for training a well-generalized model can be explored to foster the transferability of adversarial examples.

We first investigate the typical manners (Wang et al. 2020) for facilitating the generalization ability of the model and then summarize them as follows:

- **More data.** Collecting more data is always a simple yet effective avenue to alleviate the overfitting issues. In our case, collecting more data amounts to training more models with diverse architectures as the proxy models, i.e., ensemble attack. However, despite the simplicity of this avenue, training a model per se is a resource-intensive task, let alone the computation cost required to train multiple models, especially in large-scale datasets such as ImageNet.
- **Robust optimization algorithms.** Robust optimization algorithms can avoid converging in local minima, e.g., momentum optimization, but such algorithms were exploited and in related works (Dong et al. 2018).
- **Model regularization.** Model regularization attempt to reduce the expression capacity of the model in the fashion of adding the constraints or penalties for model weights, e.g., L_1 and L_2 regularization. Subsequently, the regularized model is forced to focus on extracting the most discriminative knowledge, thereby avoiding the overfitting issue. Moreover, such methods can be derived with Bayes approach (Williams 1995), where each parameter in the model is given a certain prior distribution (knowledge). For example, if we give a Gaussian or Laplace prior centered at zero on model parameters, the L_1 and L_2 regularization are derived.

Based on the above analysis, since Bayes approach can considerably mitigate the overfitting problem, we seek to utilize it for crafting more transferable adversarial examples in the next subsection.

Adversarial examples with Bayes Approach

Given an arbitrary input x with the group-truth label y and the proxy model $M(\cdot)$, the vanilla transfer-based adversarial attacks solve the following optimization task for generating the adversarial noises δ :

$$\delta^* = \arg \min_{\delta} p(y|x + \delta, M), \quad s.t., \|\delta\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where ϵ is a constant to control the maximum magnitude of δ^* , i.e., attack strength. The crafted δ^* is optimal for proxy model M , but always weak for the target black-box model due to δ^* being overfitted to M . Under the Bayes frame-

work, the above optimization task is rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^* &= \arg \min_{\delta} p(y|x + \delta, M) \\ &= \arg \min_{\delta} \int p(y|x' + \delta)p(x'|M)dx', \quad s.t., \|\delta\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Recall that, in the context of this paper, the x is analogous to the model. Hence, Equation 2 can be understood as that, we train a well-performed model x given the data M and then sample a model x' from $P(x'|M)$ for crafting δ . Notice that, the sampled $x' \sim P(x'|M)$ should be similar x and we call this sampling process as sampling x' from the underlying manifold around x .

The posterior distribution $p(x'|M)$ is known as being intractable and thus it is a common practice (Blei, Kucukelbir, and McAuliffe 2017) to use a variational distribution $q(x')$ to approximate $p(x'|M)$. By substituting $q(x')$ for $p(x'|M)$, there is:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^* &= \arg \min_{\delta} \int p(y|x' + \delta)q(x')dx' + KL(q(x')||p(x')), \\ & \quad s.t., \|\delta\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where KL divergence encourage the variational distribution $q(x')$ to close $p(x')$. For simplifying Equation 3, we assume that both $p(x')$ and $q(x')$ are the uniform distribution around the manifold (Blei, Kucukelbir, and McAuliffe 2017) centered with x and thus the KL divergence can be omitted. After that, Equation 3 can be approximately solved by Monte Carlo integration with some dozens of x'_i sampled independently from $q(x')$ so as to acquire the unbiased estimate $\log p(y|x' + \delta)$. Equation 3 is now rewritten as follows:

$$\delta^* = \arg \min_{\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \log p(y|x'_i + \delta), \quad s.t., \|\delta\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon, \quad (4)$$

where $x'_i \sim q(x')$, $i = 1, \dots, N$.




Figure 1: Comparison of vanilla transfer-based adversarial attack and our method.

MaskBlock as a Prior Knowledge

The key challenge now is developing a concrete sampling method to implement Equation 4. As aforementioned, $q(x')$ is assumed to be distributed uniformly in the manifold around x and, intuitively, there are two principles required to follow: (1) the sampled $x' \sim q(x')$ and x should be highly




Figure 2: Given a fixed s , we repeatedly implement Equation 5 to obtain multiple masked images and then compute average loss over these masked images. The final results is averaged over 10000 images randomly sampled from ImageNet.

overlapped semantically, i.e., only a minor difference to human eyes, and (2) x' can perform well on data M , i.e., the loss associated with x' is comparable to x .

Guiding by the above ideas, we develop a sensible approach called MaskBlock. As shown in Figure 1, unlike the vanilla methods that directly fed the image into the network, MaskBlock divides an image into regular non-overlapping patches and masks, following a uniform distribution, a patch of the image repeatedly to produce multiple masked images. Then, these masked images are sent into the network for collaboratively crafting the adversarial examples. On the one hand, despite an area of the original input being discarded, the resultant (masked) input is in close proximity to its original version, i.e., highly overlapped semantically. On the other hand, we evaluate the performance of x' in the presence of data M , where, as shown in Figure 2, the losses associated with such masked images are still fairly comparable to its seminal one. Therefore, MaskBlock is in line with the two principles.

Formally, given the patch of size s and a positive integer u uniformly extracted from $\{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{h}{s} \rfloor\}$, x' is obtained as follows:

$$x' = mask_u \cdot x$$

$$mask_u[i, j, k] = \begin{cases} 0, & su \leq i, j \leq \min\{s(u+1), h\}, \\ 1, & otherwise, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $x, x', mask_u \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times w \times c}$ and $mask_u[i, j, k]$ denotes the value at i -th row, j -th column, and k -th channel of the mask.

Uniform Form for Various Attacks

Though many effective transfer-based attack methods have been developed in the literature, the researchers commonly only provide intuitive explanations or just empirical evidence, i.e., lacking analysis on why they work. Interestingly, these methods also can be understood with Bayes approach. In fact, if we rewritten $x' = mask_u \cdot x$ in Eq.5 as $x' = \mathcal{M}(x)$ where $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ denotes a certain operation on the input, these attack methods can be derived by defining $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$. Due to limited space, we just simply give rough descriptions instead of the formal form of $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$.

- **Variance-Reduced Attack (VR) (Wu et al. 2018).** Variance-Reduced attack attempts to impose Gaussian noise into inputs during attacking, where $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ is a random perturbation function.
- **Diverse Inputs Attack (DI) (Xie et al. 2019).** If $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ is defined as a randomly resizing and padding function with a given probability, diverse inputs attack is derived.
- **Translation-Invariant Attack (TI) (Dong et al. 2019).** Translation-invariant Attack uses a set of translated images to produce adversarial examples, in which $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ is a translate function of the image.
- **Scale-Invariant Attack (SI) (Lin et al. 2020).** Scale-Invariant attack is conducted with multiple scaled input and we can define $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ as a scale function to derive it.
- **Admix Attack (Admix) (Wang et al. 2021).** Admix Attack mix a minor portion for a set of reference images into the original image to compute gradient used to update, where $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ is a add function.
- **Integrated Gradients Attack (IG) (Huang and Kong 2022).** Integrated Gradients Attack uses a mix of a reference image and the original image to craft adversarial examples, where $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ is a mix operation.

Discussion. Such attacks can be derived by defining a specified form of $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$, and $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ defined in such attacks does not violate the principle both of semantic-invariant and loss-preserving. Therefore, the effectiveness of these attacks can be naturally explained with Bayes treatment. Besides, we highlight that, these sampling methods, $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ defined in different attacks, complement to each other and can be ensembled to obtain better approximation, i.e., crafting more transferable adversarial examples. We will show that in the next section.

Experiment

Experiment Settings

Proxy and Target Models. To exhaustively examine the effectiveness of MaskBlock, we conduct experiments on both normal models and secured models. For normal models, we consider four top-performance models covering various architectures: DenseNet121, GoogLeNet, Inception, MNASNet. For secured models, we consider two state-of-the-art adversarially trained models including AdvInceptionV3 and AdvIncResV2_{ens} (Tramèr et al. 2018). Adversarial training is arguably the most promising and effective defense till now (Xu et al. 2020). Normal models serve as the proxy model throughout the experiment, while both normal and secured models as the target model to test the effectiveness of MaskBlock, respectively.

Competitors. In principle, MaskBlock is compatible with any transfer-based black-box attacks. Therefore, to corroborate the complementing effect introduced by MaskBlock, we not only validate the effectiveness of MaskBlock in vanilla adversarial attack, i.e., basic iterative method (BIM), but also in four sorts of cutting-edge transfer-based attacks: MI (Dong et al. 2018), IG (Huang and Kong 2022), IAA (Zhu, Sun, and Li 2022), and Hybrid. Hybrid ensembles all enhance measures including the above six ones. Moreover, we

Table 1: The ASR of different black-box attacks against diverse target models.

Proxy Model	Target Model	DenseNet121	GoogLeNet	Inception	MNASNet
DenseNet121	BIM	-	64.91	57.83	73.15
	DI	-	73.37	64.24	78.85
	TI	-	78.65	75.2	83.07
	VT	-	75.42	77.6	78.5
	MaskBlock	-	81.82	71.23	87.08
GoogLeNet	BIM	57.41	-	55.56	60.71
	DI	65.16	-	64.41	69.66
	TI	70.89	-	72.87	71.01
	VT	71.56	-	74.71	72.52
	MaskBlock	72.07	-	75.20	73.81
Inception	BIM	46.21	52.11	-	48.97
	DI	54	58.6	-	58.93
	TI	58.92	62.46	-	60.66
	VT	62.3	65.98	-	63.3
	MaskBlock	63.45	66.41	-	67.19
MNASNet	BIM	57.4	54.48	51.78	-
	DI	62.59	62.02	56.98	-
	TI	75.71	71.21	70.03	-
	VT	72.9	73.36	65.7	-
	MaskBlock	73.22	67.33	70.49	-

also compare the attack performance of MaskBlock with multiple black-box transfer-based attacks including DI (Xie et al. 2019), TI (Dong et al. 2019), VT (Wang and He 2021), and we validate the effectiveness of MaskBlock facing several defense solutions: HGD (Liao et al. 2018), R&P (Xie et al. 2018), and MMD (rank-3 submission defense for NIPS 2017 defense competition).

Dataset and Metric. Following the standard evaluation procedure (Xie et al. 2019; Dong et al. 2019, 2018; Wang and He 2021; Huang and Kong 2022; Zhu, Sun, and Li 2022), we report the attack results of different state-of-the-art attack methods over 10000 images randomly extracted from the benchmark dataset ImageNet. Attack success rate (ASR), the misclassified rate of these adversarial examples in the target model, is used as the evaluation metric. Notice that higher ASR represents better attack performance, or higher transferability of adversarial examples.

Others. If not specified otherwise, we follow the same default settings over experiments (Zhu, Sun, and Li 2022), where the maximum perturbation budget ϵ and patch size s is fixed to 16/255 and 56. Besides, the iteration numbers T and step size s are set to 10 and 2/255. All experiments are run on a single Tesla V100.

The Evaluation of MaskBlock

We first evaluate the improvement of MaskBlock to BIM on normal models. Table 1 reports the transfer results of adversarial examples crafted by BIM and MaskBlock over diverse proxy-target model pairs. As can be seen, whatever the proxy and target model is, MaskBlock can consistently enhance the black-box attack effectiveness of BIM by a large

margin for nearly all proxy models, indicating that the effectiveness of MaskBlock does not heavily rely on the type of proxy models and the crafted adversarial examples are more robust. As an example, in the case of DenseNet121 being the proxy model, ASR of adversarial examples produced by MaskBlock is considerably improved by about 15% averagely compared to baseline BIM. We owe the effectiveness of MaskBlock to the advantage of Bayes approach, which can alleviate the overfitting problem, i.e., make crafted adversarial examples more generalized.

In addition, we also compare the attack performance of MaskBlock with DI, TI, and VT in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, the attack performance of MaskBlock remarkably surpasses other methods in most cases. In the case DenseNet121 \rightarrow MNASNet, the ASR of MaskBlock is higher than other methods by at least 4.1%.

Hybrid Attack

To further validate the generality of MaskBlock, we evaluate the effect of MaskBlock being equipped with black-box attacks and the results are reported in Table 2. Note that Table 2 does not report gains induced by MaskBlock for attack effectiveness of other black-box attacks (e.g., MI) separately. This is mainly due to the page limit but we highlight that, the primary goal of the paper is to present that MaskBlock is a beneficial additive to transfer-based black-box attacks. In other words, if MaskBlock can boost the attack results of the most threatening black-box attack method, MaskBlock can produce positive influences in transfer-based black-box attacks, since we always focus on strong attacks, not weak attacks. Therefore, without loss of utility of MaskBlock, Table 2 only show the availability of MaskBlock to strongest

Table 2: The ASR of advanced black-box attacks against diverse target models.

Proxy Model	Target Model	DenseNet121	GoogLeNet	Inception	MNASNet
DenseNet121	MI	-	84.92	81.27	86.24
	IG	-	82.68	82.38	84.35
	IAA	-	85.19	80.83	88.45
	Hybird	-	88.23	85.39	93.96
	Hybird+MaskBlock	-	89.76	87.85	96.09
GoogLeNet	MI	77.87	-	76.75	79.86
	IG	78.31	-	74.87	80.45
	IAA	77.74	-	77.6	80.35
	Hybird	80.77	-	79.99	84.68
	Hybird+MaskBlock	84.41	-	83.15	87.71
Inception	MI	69.58	74.61	-	73.77
	IG	70.78	77.73	-	72.38
	IAA	69.17	76.48	-	75.05
	Hybird	76.2	78.03	-	81.42
	Hybird+MaskBlock	78.55	80.81	-	83.73
MNASNet	MI	74.15	76.67	72.6	-
	IG	74.81	75.71	73.18	-
	IAA	75.49	79.66	70.95	-
	Hybird	81.48	81.33	77.2	-
	Hybird+MaskBlock	83.59	83.72	77.49	-

black-box attack Hybird. From Table 2, a first glance illustrates that Hybird attack with MaskBlock consistently surpasses state-of-the-art black-box attacks including Hybird itself. Averagely, by observing Table 2, MaskBlock can consistently bring about 1~3% gains on ASR for all proxy-target pairs, suggesting MaskBlock indeed is a beneficial additive to black-box attacks. For instance, if the proxy and target model are DenseNet121 and MNASNet, the most effective, except Hybird with MaskBlock, remains a ASR of 93.96%, while MaskBlock can effectively bring up it to 96.09%. In short, by adding MaskBlock in existing black-box attacks, the produced adversarial examples are more capable of transferring over different target models. This further demonstrates MaskBlock can effectively alleviate the overfitting problem of produced adversarial examples.

Attack on Advanced Defense Models

In addition to the normal models, we further examine the effectiveness of MaskBlock on secured models that trained with advanced defense method ensemble adversarial training. Table 3 reports the effect of MaskBlock being added in BIM and Hybird attack against robust secured models. Compared with pure BIM and Hybird attack without MaskBlock, MaskBlock can bring a significant improvement in all scenarios, which indicates that MaskBlock improves the threat of adversarial examples towards black-box domains. For transfer DenseNet121 \rightarrow AdvIncResV2_{ens}, BIM and Hybird with MaskBlock achieves ASRs of 48.59% and 57.78% which is 5.34% and 2.93% higher than pure BIM and Hybird attacks respectively. In short, MaskBlock is effective for enhancing the cross-model black-box transferability of crafted adversarial examples, in spite of normal or secured models.




Figure 3: Visualization of adversarial examples with different methods. Due to limited page, we only compare adversarial examples crafted by TI, Diverse, and Momentum attacks.

Attack on Other Defense Strategies

In this subsection, we validate the attack effectiveness of MaskBlock against three defense strategies, i.e., HGD, R&P, and MMD and Table 4 reports the attack results. In short, even facing defense strategies, MaskBlock still can achieve better attack performance, compared with four popular attacks in Table 4.

Ablation Study

Visualization of crafted adversarial examples. To intuitively observe the attack results, Figure 3 illustrates several original images and their corresponding adversarial examples generated by MaskBlock and multiple black-box attack methods. It can be seen that these adversarial exam-

Table 3: The attack results on secured models. Due to the page limit, we here only report the attack results when the former eight models as proxy models.

Proxy Model	Target Model	AdvIncV3	AdvIncResV2 _{ens}
DenseNet121	BIM	51.99	43.25
	+MaskBlock	57.61	48.59
	Hibird	69.13	54.85
	+MaskBlock	70.32	57.78
GoogLeNet	BIM	56.60	43.65
	+MaskBlock	59.19	48.55
	Hibird	69.36	53.78
	+MaskBlock	70.88	54.50
Inception	BIM	55.86	43.05
	+MaskBlock	58.11	46.09
	Hibird	69.78	54.79
	+MaskBlock	71.02	56.61
MNASNet	BIM	54.61	42.35
	+MaskBlock	57.36	47.83
	Hibird	70.01	54.06
	+MaskBlock	71.23	55.80

Table 4: The ASR of different attacks (FGSM (Goodfellow, Shlens, and Szegedy 2014), BIM (Kurakin, Goodfellow, and Bengio 2016), PGD (Madry et al. 2017), CW (Carlini and Wagner 2017)) against several defense solutions, where proxy model and target model is DenseNet121 and GoogLeNet, respectively.

Defense	None	HGD	R&P	MMD
FGSM	64.03	53.60	48.16	55.09
BIM	64.91	56.52	48.91	57.18
PGD	70.92	56.20	54.63	60.49
CW	56.22	42.94	35.58	46.51
MaskBlock	81.82	67.53	63.17	71.90

ples look overall similar, but the adversarial perturbations of MaskBlock are more threatening (fools more model) and human-imperceptible.

Impact of block size. We here study the performance of MaskBlock over different size s and Figure 4 shows the results. As illustrated in Figure 4, when the patch size s varies from 0 to 56, the transferability of crafted adversarial examples increases significantly; when the patch size s rises from 56, the transferability fluctuates or decreases slightly. In fact, if s is low, the produced x' fails to cover the manifold around x since x' and x are excessively similar, and in this situation, increasing s can boost the transferability of produced adversarial examples. In contrast, if s is high, as demonstrated in Figure 2, the loss of produced x' is considerably higher than x , suggesting the x' no longer locates in the manifold, i.e., transferability decreases.




Figure 4: The performance of MaskBlock over different $s \in \{0, 56, 84, 112, 140, 168\}$.

Ethics Statement

This paper designs a novel approach to enhance the transferability of AEs. While this approach is easy-to-implement and seems harmful, it is believed that the benefits of publishing MaskBlock outweigh the potential harms. It is better to expose the blind spots of DNNs as soon as feasible because doing so can alert deployers to be aware of potential threats and greatly encourage AI community to design corresponding defense strategies.

Conclusion

In this paper, we rethink the transferable adversarial examples from the Bayes perspective and arguably formulated producing transferable adversarial examples as a Bayes posterior inference problem. Since Bayes posterior inference problem generally is intractable, we proposed a simple yet effective method MaskBlock to approximately solve the problem. Besides, we also presented that the proposed framework is a generalization version for various attack methods, such as diverse inputs attack. Then, extensive experiments, including attacks on undefended and defended models, and combinations with the previous black-box methods, are conducted. The experimental results demonstrate MaskBlock is compatible with other advanced attacks and able to avoid getting stuck in the local optimum of a specific model, i.e., enhancing the cross-model black-box transferability of adversarial examples, especially combining with other methods. Our findings can motivate new research into the adversarial transferability from Bayes perspective and more accurately assess the robustness of models under the black-box scenario.

References

- Al-Saffar, A. A. M.; Tao, H.; and Talab, M. A. 2017. Review of deep convolution neural network in image classification. In *2017 International Conference on Radar, Antenna, Microwave, Electronics, and Telecommunications (ICRAMET)*, 26–31. IEEE.
- Batmaz, Z.; Yurekli, A.; Bilge, A.; and Kaleli, C. 2019. A review on deep learning for recommender systems: challenges and remedies. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 52(1): 1–37.
- Blei, D. M.; Kucukelbir, A.; and McAuliffe, J. D. 2017. Variational inference: A review for statisticians. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 112(518): 859–877.
- Bolstad, W. M.; and Curran, J. M. 2016. *Introduction to Bayesian statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Carlini, N.; and Wagner, D. 2017. Towards Evaluating the Robustness of Neural Networks. 39–57.
- Croce, F.; and Hein, M. 2020. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. In *International conference on machine learning*, 2206–2216. PMLR.
- Dong, Y.; Liao, F.; Pang, T.; Su, H.; Zhu, J.; Hu, X.; and Li, J. 2018. Boosting adversarial attacks with momentum. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 9185–9193.
- Dong, Y.; Pang, T.; Su, H.; and Zhu, J. 2019. Evading defenses to transferable adversarial examples by translation-invariant attacks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 4312–4321.
- Goodfellow, I. J.; Shlens, J.; and Szegedy, C. 2014. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*.
- Huang, Q.; Katsman, I.; He, H.; Gu, Z.; Belongie, S.; and Lim, S.-N. 2019. Enhancing adversarial example transferability with an intermediate level attack. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 4733–4742.
- Huang, Y.; and Kong, A. W.-K. 2022. Transferable Adversarial Attack based on Integrated Gradients. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Kurakin, A.; Goodfellow, I. J.; and Bengio, S. 2016. Adversarial Examples in The Physical World. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02533*.
- Liao, F.; Liang, M.; Dong, Y.; Pang, T.; Zhu, J.; and Hu, X. 2018. Defense against Adversarial Attacks Using High-Level Representation Guided Denoiser. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lin, J.; Song, C.; He, K.; Wang, L.; and Hopcroft, J. E. 2020. Nesterov Accelerated Gradient and Scale Invariance for Adversarial Attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Madry, A.; Makelov, A.; Schmidt, L.; Tsipras, D.; and Vladu, A. 2017. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06083*.
- Mao, X.; Chen, Y.; Wang, S.; Su, H.; He, Y.; and Xue, H. 2021. Composite Adversarial Attacks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, 8884–8892.
- Shukla, S. N.; Sahu, A. K.; Willmott, D.; and Kolter, Z. 2021. Simple and Efficient Hard Label Black-box Adversarial Attacks in Low Query Budget Regimes. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 1461–1469.
- Torfi, A.; Shirvani, R. A.; Keneshloo, Y.; Tavvaf, N.; and Fox, E. A. 2020. Natural Language Processing Advancements By Deep Learning: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01200*.
- Tramèr, F.; Boneh, D.; Kurakin, A.; Goodfellow, I.; Papernot, N.; and McDaniel, P. 2018. Ensemble adversarial training: Attacks and defenses. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018-Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Wang, X.; and He, K. 2021. Enhancing the transferability of adversarial attacks through variance tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1924–1933.
- Wang, X.; He, X.; Wang, J.; and He, K. 2021. Admix: Enhancing the transferability of adversarial attacks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 16158–16167.
- Wang, Y.; Yao, Q.; Kwok, J. T.; and Ni, L. M. 2020. Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 53(3): 1–34.
- Williams, P. M. 1995. Bayesian regularization and pruning using a Laplace prior. *Neural computation*, 7(1): 117–143.
- Wu, D.; Wang, Y.; Xia, S.-T.; Bailey, J.; and Ma, X. 2020. Skip Connections Matter: On the Transferability of Adversarial Examples Generated with ResNets. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Wu, L.; Zhu, Z.; Tai, C.; et al. 2018. Understanding and enhancing the transferability of adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09707*.
- Xie, C.; Wang, J.; Zhang, Z.; Ren, Z.; and Yuille, A. 2018. Mitigating Adversarial Effects Through Randomization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xie, C.; Zhang, Z.; Zhou, Y.; Bai, S.; Wang, J.; Ren, Z.; and Yuille, A. L. 2019. Improving transferability of adversarial examples with input diversity. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2730–2739.
- Xu, H.; Ma, Y.; Liu, H.-C.; Deb, D.; Liu, H.; Tang, J.-L.; and Jain, A. K. 2020. Adversarial attacks and defenses in images, graphs and text: A review. *International Journal of Automation and Computing*, 17(2): 151–178.
- Yan, Z.; Guo, Y.; Liang, J.; and Zhang, C. 2020. Policy-Driven Attack: Learning to Query for Hard-label Black-box Adversarial Examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhang, C.; Bütetage, J.; Kjellström, H.; and Mandt, S. 2018. Advances in variational inference. *IEEE transactions on*

pattern analysis and machine intelligence, 41(8): 2008–2026.

Zhu, Y.; Sun, J.; and Li, Z. 2022. Rethinking Adversarial Transferability from a Data Distribution Perspective. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.