

Adversarial Catoptric Light: An Effective, Stealthy and Robust Physical-World Attack to DNNs

Chengyin Hu
University of Electronic Science
and Technology of China
Chengdu, China
cyhuuestc@gmail.com

Weiwen Shi
University of Electronic Science
and Technology of China
Chengdu, China
Weiwen_shi@foxmail.com

Abstract

Deep neural networks (DNNs) have demonstrated exceptional success across various tasks, underscoring the need to evaluate the robustness of advanced DNNs. However, traditional methods using stickers as physical perturbations to deceive classifiers present challenges in achieving stealthiness and suffer from printing loss. Recent advancements in physical attacks have utilized light beams such as lasers and projectors to perform attacks, where the optical patterns generated are artificial rather than natural. In this study, we introduce a novel physical attack, adversarial catoptric light (**AdvCL**), where adversarial perturbations are generated using a common natural phenomenon, catoptric light, to achieve stealthy and naturalistic adversarial attacks against advanced DNNs in a black-box setting. We evaluate the proposed method in three aspects: effectiveness, stealthiness, and robustness. Quantitative results obtained in simulated environments demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method, and in physical scenarios, we achieve an attack success rate of 83.5%, surpassing the baseline. We use common catoptric light as a perturbation to enhance the stealthiness of the method and make physical samples appear more natural. Robustness is validated by successfully attacking advanced and robust DNNs with a success rate over 80% in all cases. Additionally, we discuss defense strategy against AdvCL and put forward some light-based physical attacks.

1. Introduction

Deep neural networks have made significant advances in image classification and object detection in recent years. At the same time, many vision-based applications, such as UAVs and autonomous driving, are gaining popularity. Recent advances, however, have shown that advanced DNNs are vulnerable to minor perturbations, even if only one pixel




Figure 1. An example. When the camera of a self-driving car captures objects projected with carefully designed catoptric light, it fails to recognize the "Street sign" and "Minivan".

is modified [36]. It is critical to assess the dependability of advanced DNNs in safety-critical scenarios (medical, autonomous driving, etc.). Until now, most research has focused on attacks in digital environments [7, 42, 27], which target advanced DNNs by adding imperceptible perturbations to images. Some researchers have gradually devoted themselves to the study of physical attacks [23, 8, 13], which differ from digital attacks in that images are captured by cameras and then fed to the target model. Since it is difficult to capture subtle perturbations with the camera, the physical perturbations are designed to be much larger. Physical perturbations are thus detectable by human observers. When an attacker executes physical attacks, there is a trade-off between robustness and stealthiness.

Many natural phenomena, such as natural light and shadows, play the role of physical perturbations, which can lead to tragic crashes involving self-driving cars. If common catoptric light is used as an attack weapon to launch physical attacks against advanced DNNs, vision-based systems



Figure 2. Visual comparison.

may be jeopardized. At the same time, given the common natural catoptric light, it may reduce defender vigilance. As shown in Figure 1, the attacker projects a carefully designed catoptric light onto the street sign, preventing the self-driving car from correctly recognizing it.

Until now, most physical attacks have been carried out using stickers [13, 35], and such methods can usually achieve robust adversarial effects without changing the original information of the target object. However, sticker-based physical attacks are difficult to conceal. Light beams are used as physical perturbations in some physical attacks to perform physical attacks [29, 50, 12, 31], light transience is used in such attacks to achieve physical stealthiness. These light-based perturbation patterns, on the other hand, are man-made rather than natural. [49] performs attacks using common shadows as natural adversarial perturbations, which studies the effects of daytime attacks. Our method, on the other hand, studies physical attacks at night by employing catoptric light as natural adversarial perturbations. Furthermore, some researchers have investigated camera-based physical attacks [24], in which a tiny translucent patch is stuck to a mobile phone’s camera to perform physical attacks. However, the physical samples generated by such an attack can easily raise defenders’ suspicions.

We present a novel light-based physical attack called adversarial catoptric light (AdvCL) in this paper. Unlike traditional sticker-based physical attacks, our approach uses light as a perturbation, giving AdvCL flexibility. In contrast to recent light-based physical attacks, our approach employs a common phenomenon, catoptric light, as pertur-

bations, making our physical sample appear more natural. Figure 2 shows a visual comparison of physical samples created using AdvCL and other methods. The adversarial sample generated by AdvCL is stealthier than other methods such as RP2 [13], AdvLB [12], and shadow attack [49].

Our approach is easy to deploy physical attacks, by formalizing the physical parameters of catoptric light, genetic algorithm [18] is used to find the most aggressive ones, then based on which, projecting catoptric light to the target objects to generate physical samples. Notably, our approach enables low-cost attacks, requiring only a budget of less than 20 USD, rendering it significantly easier to deploy. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a new light-based attack called adversarial catoptric light (AdvCL), which takes advantage of the properties of light to launch an effective, stealthy, and robust attack (See Section 1). At the same time, the total cost of our devices is under 20 USD, making it simple to launch such an attack.
- We present and analyze existing methods (See Section 2), demonstrate effective optimization strategies, and conduct extensive experiments to validate AdvCL’s effectiveness, stealthiness, and robustness (See Section 3, Section 4). Our results indicate that AdvCL is capable of achieving high success rates while remaining inconspicuous to the naked eye, even in challenging real-world scenarios. Given these findings, we believe that AdvCL represents a valuable tool for further studying the threat posed by light-based attacks in realistic settings.
- We conduct adversarial defense against AdvCL via adversarial training (See Section 5). At the same time, we propose some new light-based physical attacks (See Section 6).

2. Related work

2.1. Digital attacks

Szegedy et al. [39] proposed the adversarial attack first, demonstrating that advanced DNNs are susceptible to interference from minor perturbations, after which adversarial attacks were successfully proposed [15, 28, 36, 27].

Most digital attacks keep adversarial perturbations small enough to be imperceptible to human observers. Among them, the most commonly used norms are l_2 and l_∞ [5, 6, 10, 26, 44]. Furthermore, some researchers alter other attributes of digital images, such as color [19, 32, 48], texture and camouflage [43, 41, 47, 40], to generate adversarial samples. These methods produce perturbations that are barely detectable by human observers. At the same time,




Figure 3. The attacker uses genetic algorithm to optimize the simulation samples, and uses EOT to achieve the domain transition of digital samples to physical samples. Finally, the catoptric light is projected onto the target object to fool the classifier.

some researchers alter the physical parameters of digital images [46, 25], retaining only the key components in order to generate adversarial samples. In general, digital attacks assume that an attacker can modify the input image, but this is not practical in a physical scenario.

2.2. Physical attacks

Kurakin et al. [23] were the first to propose physical attack. Following this work, many physical attacks were proposed [13, 45, 4, 33, 1].

Traditional street sign attacks. Ivan Evtimov et al. proposed RP2 [13], which performs attacks against advanced DNNs by using black-white stickers as perturbations. However, at long distances and angles, RP2 is susceptible to environmental interference. Eykholt et al. [35] improved RP2 to generate robust and transferable adversarial samples in order to fool advanced DNNs. However, the perturbations cover a large enough area to be noticeable. Chen et al. [8] and Huang et al. [21] proposed ShapeShifter and the improved ShapeShifter, which perturb areas beyond the “stop” and were successful in fooling advanced DNNs. However, they have a flaw: the perturbations cover almost the entire road sign, preventing it from being stealthy. AdvCam, proposed by Duan et al. [11], generates adversarial samples and disguises perturbations as a style considered reasonable by human observers, but it requires manual selection of the attack area and target. Overall, the methods described above necessitate manual modification of the target objects. Furthermore, these works fell short of achieving stealthiness.

Light-based attack. Duan et al. [12] proposed AdvLB, which executes attacks by using laser beams as perturbations. It is more flexible than conventional street sign attacks. However, in physical attack scenarios, it is prone to space errors. Gnanasambandam et al. [14] proposed OPAD, which amplifies and projects subtle digital perturbations onto the target object to generate physical samples. Human observers, on the other hand, are suspicious of its

irregular projection patterns. Zhong et al. [49] studied a shadow-based physical attack in which adversarial samples were generated by casting carefully crafted shadows on the target object, resulting in a natural black-box attack. This shadow attack, however, cannot be used in low-light conditions. Importantly, when carrying out such an attack, the cardboard must be placed very close to the target object (see Figure 2), which is easily suspicious to human observers. Our proposed AdvCL, on the other hand, uses the retroreflector as a tool and places it at a relatively large spatial distance from the target object, which raises less suspicion. Because the proposed AdvCL uses natural catoptric light as a perturbation to perform physical attacks in low-light conditions, it is a complement to shadow attack.

Camera-based attack. Li et al. [24] investigated camera-based attacks by placing well-designed stickers on the camera lens to generate adversarial samples, this method avoids physically manipulating the target by physically manipulating the camera itself. However, the physical samples generated by this method are suspect, and access to the victim’s camera is impractical.

3. Approach

Given an input picture X , a ground truth label Y , and a DNN classifier f . $f(X)$ represents the classifier’s prediction label for picture X . The classifier f associates with a confidence score $f_Y(X)$ to class Y . The adversarial sample X_{adv} has two properties: (1) $f(X_{adv}) \neq f(X) = Y$; (2) $\|X_{adv} - X\| < \epsilon$. Among them, the first property requires X_{adv} fools DNN classifier f . The second property requires that the perturbations of X_{adv} be small enough for human observers to notice.

In this work, we use genetic algorithm [18] to optimize the physical parameters of catoptric light. Then, in the real scenarios, we project catoptric light onto a target object and generate physical samples. Figure 3 shows our approach.




Figure 4. Experimental devices.

3.1. Generate adversarial sample

In this paper, we define catoptric light using three physical parameters: location \mathcal{P}_l , color $\mathcal{C}(r, g, b)$, intensity \mathcal{I} . Each parameter is described as follows:

Location \mathcal{P}_l : We propose finding a polygon \mathcal{P}_l to simulate the catoptric light, which is expressed by a set of vertices $l = (m_1, n_1), (m_2, n_2), \dots, (m_k, n_k)$, for the location of catoptric light. The catoptric light region can be expressed as $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{P}_l$ where \mathcal{M} is used as the mask to locate the target object. Although \mathcal{P}_l can be any polygon, we perform attacks with various polygons in Section 4, and the experimental results show that triangles are sufficient to generate successful adversarial samples. We can use various polygons to increase attack success rates, but such a catoptric light would look unnatural and would be difficult to implement in a physical scenario. As a result, in the physical experiments, we employ triangle catoptric light to carry out attacks.

Color $\mathcal{C}(r, g, b)$: $\mathcal{C}(r, g, b)$ denotes the color of the catoptric light, where r , g , and b denote the red, green, and blue channels of the catoptric light respectively.

Intensity \mathcal{I} : \mathcal{I} indicates the intensity of catoptric light.

Note that it is not practical to generate various colors of catoptric light (e.g. black) in the physical environment, therefore, color is specified in the physical test for optimization (such as white, yellow). Meanwhile, we select the catoptric light intensity in the physical test using the experimental results in Table 1, see Section 4 for details.

The parameters \mathcal{P}_l , $\mathcal{C}(r, g, b)$ and \mathcal{I} form a catoptric light’s physical parameter $\theta(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I})$. We define a simple function $S(X; \theta(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I}), \mathcal{M})$ that simply synthesizes the input image with catoptric light to generate an adversarial sample (for more information on how to generate adversarial sample using equation 1, see the code in the supplementary materials.), which can be expressed as follows:

$$X_{adv} = S(X; \theta(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I}), \mathcal{M}) \quad (1)$$

Expectation Over Transformation. EOT [1] is a powerful tool for managing the transition from digital to physical domains. we define a transformation \mathcal{T} , which is a random combination of digital image processing, such as brightness adaptation, position offset, color variation, and so on. Through EOT, the physical sample can be represented as follows:

$$X_{phy} = \mathcal{T}(X_{adv}; \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I}) \quad (2)$$

3.2. Genetic algorithm

John Holland created the genetic algorithm (GA) [18] as a natural metaheuristic algorithm based on the laws of biological evolution in nature. It is a computational model that simulates the biological evolution process of natural selection and the genetic mechanism of Darwin’s biological evolution in order to find the best solution by simulating the natural evolution process.

We use no model gradient information in this work, only the confidence score and prediction label from model feedback. Among the advantages of using GA to optimize AdvCL are:

(1) GA searches the string set of solutions of the problem, which covers a large area and is conducive to global optimization. In our method, physical parameters \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{P}_l and \mathcal{I} include a total of $256 \times 256 \times 256 \times 512 \times 512 \times 6 \times 4$ combinations of problem solutions (in which $\mathcal{C}(256 \times 256 \times 256)$, \mathcal{P}_l ($512 \times 512 \times 6$), \mathcal{I} (4)), GA is conducive to the global optimization of AdvCL.

(2) GA does not require any knowledge of the search space or any other auxiliary information, it uses the fitness value to evaluate individuals and performs genetic operations on this basis. The fitness function is not constrained by continuous differentiability, and the domain of its definition can be set arbitrarily. AdvCL does not require gradient information from the model and instead uses the model’s confidence score $f_Y(X)$ as the individual fitness and $f(X_{adv}) \neq Y$ as the termination condition.

(3) A flexible selection strategy. GA organizes search using evolutionary information. Individuals with high fitness have a higher chance of survival and a more adaptable gene structure. To further broaden the search scope and achieve global optimization, AdvCL employs the flexibility of GA to select specific elimination strategies.

More information on genetic algorithm optimization can be found in the supplementary material.

3.3. Catoptric light adversarial attack

AdvCL searches for $\theta(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I})$, the physical parameters of catoptric light, to generate an adversarial sample X_{adv}

Table 1. Quantitative results at varying setups (ASR (%)).

num of edges \mathcal{P}_l	Method	\mathcal{I}									
		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	average
3	Random	12.5	24.5	45.7	53.2	71.2	79.9	87.3	90.2	92.8	61.9
	AdvCL	22.6	41.9	57.6	69.8	69.8	87.9	91.1	94.9	96.8	70.3
4	Random	14.6	26.7	49.9	58.3	77.6	82.7	89.6	92.1	93.8	65.0
	AdvCL	25.5	46.4	60.2	75.7	86.4	90.3	92.8	95.1	97.0	74.4
5	Random	15.1	27.1	51.5	63.3	79.2	85.9	90.1	93.4	94.2	66.6
	AdvCL	29.5	49.1	65.8	79.6	88.7	92.1	93.9	95.8	97.5	76.9
6	Random	17.2	30.3	53.3	65.1	82.5	87.3	92.4	94.1	95.6	68.6
	AdvCL	33.9	53.2	69.7	83.8	90.6	93.2	95.1	96.4	97.9	79.3
7	Random	20.1	33.9	56.6	69.3	85.5	89.7	93.1	95.4	96.1	71.1
	AdvCL	35.1	55.3	72.5	87.9	93.6	94.2	96.1	97.5	98.4	81.2
8	Random	21.3	35.7	57.9	71	86.3	90.6	95	96.1	96.7	72.3
	AdvCL	36.7	57.5	74.9	90.2	94.5	95.7	96.4	97.9	98.8	82.5
9	Random	22.2	36.9	59.1	72.3	87.9	91.9	96.3	96.7	96.9	73.4
	AdvCL	69.8	58.4	76.3	92.8	95.1	95.8	97.6	98.1	98.9	83.5

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode of AdvCL

Input: Input X , Classifier f , Ground truth label Y , population size $Seed$, Iterations $Step$, Crossover rate Pc , Mutation rate Pm ;

Output: A vector of parameters θ^* ;

```

1: Initialization  $Seed, Step, Pc, Pm$ ;
2: for  $seed \leftarrow 0$  to  $Seed$  do
3:   Encoding individual genotype  $G_{seed}$ ;
4: end for
5: for  $steps \leftarrow 0$  to  $Step$  do
6:   for  $seed \leftarrow 0$  to  $Seed$  do
7:      $\theta_{seed}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I}) \leftarrow G_{seed}$ ;
8:      $X_{adv}(seed) = S(X; \theta_{seed}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I}), \mathcal{M})$ ;
9:      $f_Y(X_{adv}) \leftarrow f(X_{adv})$ ;
10:    if  $f(X_{adv}) \neq Y$  then
11:       $\theta^* \leftarrow \theta_{seed}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I})$ ;
12:      if  $\mathcal{T}(X_{adv}) \rightarrow False$  then
13:        break;
14:      end if
15:      Output  $\theta^*$ ;
16:      break;
17:    end if
18:  end for
19:  Update:  $G_{seed} \xleftarrow{Selection} f_Y(X_{adv})$ ;
20:  Update:  $G_{seed} \xleftarrow{Crossover} Pc$ ;
21:  Update:  $G_{seed} \xleftarrow{Mutation} Pm$ ;
22: end for

```

that deceives the classifier f . In this experiment, we consider a practical situation in which the attacker can only obtain the confidence score $f_Y(X)$ with given input image X on ground truth label Y . In our proposed method, we use confidence score as the adversarial loss. Thus, the objec-

tive is formalized as minimizing the confidence score on the ground truth label Y , which can be expressed as:

$$\arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{t \sim \mathcal{T}} [f_Y(t(X_{adv}; \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{I}))] \quad (3)$$

$$s.t. \quad f(X_{adv}) \neq Y$$

Algorithm 1 shows the pseudocode of AdvCL. The proposed method takes clean image X , target classifier f , ground truth label Y , population size $Seed$, iteration number $Step$, crossover rate Pc , mutation rate Pm as input decided by the attacker. Details of the algorithm are explained in Algorithm 1. In this case, we weed out the top tenth with the highest confidence score (the lower the confidence score, the more antagonistic) and then fill in the randomly encoded genes separately. The advantage of this selection strategy is that it saves time by directly eliminating the most incompetent individuals while also broadening the search scope and global optimization. Furthermore, the crossover rate Pc and variation rate Pm are set to 0.7 and 0.1, respectively. Finally, the algorithm outputs the physical parameter of the catoptric light θ^* , which is used in subsequent physical attacks.

4. Evaluation

4.1. Experimental setting

We put the proposed method to the test in both digital and physical settings. Consistent with AdvLB [12], we perform attacks using ResNet50 [16] as the target model, and then randomly select 1000 ImageNet [9] images that could be correctly classified by ResNet50 to perform digital tests. For physical examinations. Figure 4 shows our experimental devices. We use iPhone 6s to take photos with color



Figure 5. Digital samples generated by AdvCL.

lamps as lighting equipment. Experiment verify that different camera devices would not affect the effectiveness of the proposed AdvCL. For all experiments, we use attack success rate (ASR) as a criterion to report the effectiveness of AdvCL, which is defined as follows:

$$ASR(X) = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F(label_i) \quad (4)$$

$$F(label_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & label_i \in L_{pre} \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

where N is the number of clean samples in the dataset X , $label_i$ represents the ground truth label of the i -th sample, L_{pre} is the set of all labels predicted under attacking.

4.2. Evaluation of effectiveness

Digital test. On 1000 images that could be correctly classified by ResNet50, we test the effectiveness of AdvCL in digital environments. We draw three conclusions from the analysis of all experimental setups and results in Table 1: **1)** The adversarial effect of AdvCL is better than that of the random attack method, demonstrating the feasibility and effectiveness of our method; **2)** The attack effectiveness increases as the number of edges \mathcal{P}_l and intensity \mathcal{I} increase, as expected; **3)** AdvCL achieves 87.9% ASR under $\mathcal{P}_l=3$ and $\mathcal{I}=0.6$, demonstrating that our method is physically practical due to the legitimate configuration, subsequent physical tests follow this configuration. Figure 5 shows some interesting results. The first column represents the samples we aim to attack, and the catoptric light of red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo and purple is added to clean samples respectively. The remaining columns are generated adversarial samples that can successfully fool the

classifier. For example, when a blue ($\mathcal{C}(0, 0, 255)$) catoptric light is added to a clean sample, the seashore is misclassified as a volcano. On the other hand, when various catoptric lights are covered, the majority of the triumphal arch is misclassified as a cliff. Overall, AdvCL has an effective adversarial effect in the digital environment, causing advanced DNNs to misclassify target objects without changing their semantic information.

Physical test. We put the proposed method to the test in a physical setting. We use a strict experimental design in the physical test to demonstrate the rigor of AdvCL. Because environmental noise affects the robustness of physical attacks in the real world, we design indoor and outdoor tests separately. The indoor test eliminates the influence of outdoor noise, while the outdoor test reflects the performance of AdvCL in real-world scenarios.

As target objects for the indoor test, we use "Bonnet", "Plastic bag", "Street sign", and so on. and generate 30 adversarial samples with a 100% ASR (ASR of 100% in AdvLB [12]). In the outdoor test, we choose "Street sign" as attack objects and generate 103 adversarial samples, achieving an ASR of 83.5% (ASR of 77.4% in AdvLB [12]). Figure 6 shows adversarial samples in an outdoor setting. The experimental results show that adding optimized catoptric light to the target objects causes advanced DNNs to misclassify the objects. To get closer to real-world scenarios, we conduct outdoor tests on a "Stop sign" from various angles, which demonstrates that AdvCL performs effective physical attacks on target objects from various angles.

4.3. Evaluation of stealthiness

As previously stated, we choose catoptric light as the physical perturbation in order to obtain a more natural physical sample, which makes our perturbation susceptible to being overlooked by human observers. As shown in Fig-




Figure 6. Physical samples generated by AdvCL.

Figure 6, our physical samples resemble natural catoptric light falling on a street sign, and human observers have difficulty distinguishing between natural and artificial catoptric light. On the other hand, the comparison of physical samples in Figure 2 shows that the physical perturbation generated by AdvCL is more stealthy than the baseline. Given AdvCL’s light-speed attack, AdvCL has greater temporal stealthiness than RP2 [13] (RP2’s physical perturbation will always adhere to the target object’s surface, but AdvCL can control the light source, generating the physical perturbation only when the attack is carried out.). In contrast to AdvLB [12], the physical samples generated by AdvCL are more natural, allowing for better spatial stealthiness in our approach. When the cardboard is placed in front of the road sign for a shadow attack [49], it loses its spatial stealthiness, making human observers suspicious, whereas our method places the retroreflector far away from the target object, making AdvCL more stealthy than shadow attacks. In general, our approach results in a more stealthy attack than the baseline.

4.4. Evaluation of robustness

Deploy AdvCL to attack various classifiers. We evaluate the robustness of the proposed AdvCL in a black-box setting with various classifiers, including the recently advanced DNNs (Inception v3 [38], VGG19 [34], ResNet101 [16], GoogleNet [37], AlexNet [22], MobileNet [30], DenseNet [20]) and robust DNNs (Augmix+ResNet50 [17], ResNet50+RS [2], NF-ResNet50 [3]). Note that the dataset is 1000 images selected from ImageNet that can be correctly classified by ResNet50. Table 2 shows the ASR of our method with different classifiers. AlexNet is found to be the most vulnerable in the black-box attack test, with a 97.2% ASR and an average of 87.4 queries. Furthermore, robust DNNs such as Augmix+ResNet50, ResNet50+RS,

Table 2. Evaluation across various classifiers.

f	w/o Attack		w/ Attack	
	Top-1 Accuracy		ASR	Query
Inception v3	87.6		83.5	152.3
VGG19	91.5		81.3	269.5
ResNet101	96.1		82.1	198.4
GoogleNet	85.3		82.3	189.5
AlexNet	79.6		97.2	87.4
MobileNet	89.7		83.0	169.2
DenseNet	90.8		81.9	243.3
Augmix+ResNet50	93.7		81.1	298.6
ResNet50-RS	94.6		80.9	330.4
NF-ResNet50	94.8		80.3	346.1

and NF-ResNet50 are more robust. In general, the data in Table 2 show that AdvCL have an adversarial effect of ASR on various models by more than 80% in the black-box setting, confirming the robustness of our proposed AdvCL.

Transferability of AdvCL. Here, we demonstrate the attack transferability of AdvCL against advanced DNNs and robust DNNs in both digital and physical environments. As the dataset, we use the adversarial samples generated by AdvCL that successfully attacked ResNet50. Table 3 displays the experimental results. It can be seen that AdvCL has effective attack transferability in the digital environment, with an attack success rate of 77.24% against AlexNet. In physical environments, AdvCL exhibits excellent attack transferability, with its transfer attack paralyzing almost all advanced DNNs.

Tables 2 and 3 show that our method is not only capable of performing black-box attacks against various classifiers, but also has a threatening adversarial effect on transfer attacks, which verifies the robustness of our proposed AdvCL.



Figure 7. ResNet50 vs. Rob-ResNet50.

Table 3. Transferability of AdvCL (ASR(%)).

f	Digital	Physical
Inception v3	71.34	97.67
VGG19	55.85	100
ResNet101	47.21	97.67
GoogleNet	67.02	100
AlexNet	77.24	100
MobileNet	63.01	97.67
DenseNet	54.58	96.51
Augmix+ResNet50	52.67	84.35
ResNet50-RS	50.91	81.65
NF-ResNet50	50.42	78.13

5. Discussion

5.1. Ablation study

Here, we perform experiment to study the adversarial effects of Color $\mathcal{C}(r, g, b)$ on AdvCL. We select 27 colors of catoptric light to execute digital attacks on ResNet50, including $\mathcal{C}(0, 0, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 0, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 0, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 127, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 127, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 127, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 255, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 255, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(0, 255, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 0, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 0, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 0, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 127, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 127, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 127, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 255, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 255, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(127, 255, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 0, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 0, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 0, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 127, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 127, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 127, 255)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 255, 0)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 255, 127)$, $\mathcal{C}(255, 255, 255)$. All of the attacks achieve an ASR over 70%, among which $\mathcal{C}(255, 0, 255)$ achieves the highest ASR 96.60%, and $\mathcal{C}(0, 0, 0)$ gets the lowest ASR 73.90%. For a detailed experimental results see supplementary material.

5.2. Defense of AdvCL

In addition to demonstrating the potential threats of AdvCL, we attempt to defend against AdvCL with adversarial training. Here, in order to rigorously study the defense strategy against the proposed attack, we construct a larger dataset. To begin, we randomly select 50 clean samples from each of ImageNet’s 1000 categories, yielding 50,000 clean samples. Second, add 27 color catoptric light to each clean sample with $\mathcal{I}=0.5$ to obtain the final data set, called ImageNet-CatoptricLight (ImageNet-CL), which contains 1.35 million adversarial samples.

For adversarial training, we use the proposed ImageNet-CL dataset. Torchvision is used to train the ResNet50 robust model (Rob-ResNet50). ADAM optimized the model on three 2080Ti GPUs with an initial learning rate of 0.01. Figure 7 depicts the experimental results. Rob-ResNet50 achieves a classification accuracy of more than 90% for adversarial samples. We deploy AdvCL to attack Rob-ResNet50 with $\mathcal{P}_l=3$, $\mathcal{I}=0.6$, and achieve 69.4% ASR with 568.3 average queries (ResNet50: 87.9% ASR, 184.9 average queries). This implies that while adversarial training can reduce AdvCL’s ASR and increase AdvCL’s attack time cost, it cannot completely defend against AdvCL. See the supplementary material for more experimental results on Rob-ResNet.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce AdvCL, a light-based physical attack that performs a physical attack by optimizing the physical parameters of catoptric light: \mathcal{P}_l , $\mathcal{C}(r, g, b)$, and \mathcal{I} . We take effectiveness, stealthiness, and robustness as criterion to evaluate the proposed method. Extensive experimental design and results demonstrate the effectiveness of AdvCL in both digital and physical environments. In terms of stealthiness, we present the generated physical sample and compare it to the baseline, demonstrating the proposed method’s stealthiness in terms of both temporal and spatial stealthiness. We employ AdvCL to launch attacks on both advanced and robust DNNs. demonstrate the attack transferability of AdvCL, experimental results verified the robustness of our proposed AdvCL. The proposed method reveals the physical-world security threat caused by light-based physical attacks. Our research also sheds new light on future physical attacks, such as using light as physical perturbations instead of stickers, which would improve physical attack flexibility. The proposed AdvCL is a useful complement to recent physical attacks as an effective, stealthy and robust light-based physical attack.

We will improve the proposed AdvCL to adapt to different tasks such as object detection, domain segmentation, etc. We will also focus on light-based physical attacks, such as adversarial projection, adversarial spot light, and so on. Furthermore, effective defense strategies against light-based attacks will emerge as a promising research area.

References

- [1] Anish Athalye, Logan Engstrom, Andrew Ilyas, and Kevin Kwok. Synthesizing robust adversarial examples. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 284–293. PMLR, 2018.
- [2] Irwan Bello, William Fedus, Xianzhi Du, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Aravind Srinivas, Tsung-Yi Lin, Jonathon Shlens, and Barret Zoph. Revisiting resnets: Improved training and scaling strategies. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 22614–22627, 2021.
- [3] Andy Brock, Soham De, Samuel L. Smith, and Karen Simonyan. High-performance large-scale image recognition without normalization. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1059–1071. PMLR, 2021.
- [4] Tom B. Brown, Dandelion Mané, Aurko Roy, Martín Abadi, and Justin Gilmer. Adversarial patch. *CoRR*, abs/1712.09665, 2017.
- [5] Nicholas Carlini and David A. Wagner. Adversarial examples are not easily detected: Bypassing ten detection methods. In Bhavani Thuraisingham, Battista Biggio, David Mandell Freeman, Brad Miller, and Arunesh Sinha, editors, *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security, AISec@CCS 2017, Dallas, TX, USA, November 3, 2017*, pages 3–14. ACM, 2017.
- [6] Nicholas Carlini and David A. Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2017, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2017*, pages 39–57. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [7] Pin-Yu Chen, Yash Sharma, Huan Zhang, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. EAD: elastic-net attacks to deep neural networks via adversarial examples. In Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18), the 30th innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, pages 10–17. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [8] Shang-Tse Chen, Cory Cornelius, Jason Martin, and Duen Horng (Polo) Chau. Shapeshifter: Robust physical adversarial attack on faster R-CNN object detector. In Michele Berlingerio, Francesco Bonchi, Thomas Gärtner, Neil Hurley, and Georgiana Ifrim, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases - European Conference, ECML PKDD 2018, Dublin, Ireland, September 10-14, 2018, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 11051 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 52–68. Springer, 2018.
- [9] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR 2009), 20-25 June 2009, Miami, Florida, USA*, pages 248–255. IEEE Computer Society, 2009.
- [10] Yinpeng Dong, Fangzhou Liao, Tianyu Pang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, Xiaolin Hu, and Jianguo Li. Boosting adversarial attacks with momentum. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 9185–9193. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [11] Ranjie Duan, Xingjun Ma, Yisen Wang, James Bailey, A. Kai Qin, and Yun Yang. Adversarial camouflage: Hiding physical-world attacks with natural styles. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020*, pages 997–1005. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [12] Ranjie Duan, Xiaofeng Mao, A. Kai Qin, Yuefeng Chen, Shaokai Ye, Yuan He, and Yun Yang. Adversarial laser beam: Effective physical-world attack to dnns in a blink. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2021, virtual, June 19-25, 2021*, pages 16062–16071. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2021.
- [13] Kevin Eykholt, Ivan Evtimov, Earlene Fernandes, Bo Li, Amir Rahmati, Chaowei Xiao, Atul Prakash, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Dawn Song. Robust physical-world attacks on deep learning visual classification. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 1625–1634. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [14] Abhiram Gnanasambandam, Alex M. Sherman, and Stanley H. Chan. Optical adversarial attack. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops, ICCVW 2021, Montreal, BC, Canada, October 11-17, 2021*, pages 92–101. IEEE, 2021.
- [15] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [16] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016*, pages 770–778. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [17] Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [18] John H Holland. Genetic algorithms. *Scientific american*, 267(1):66–73, 1992.

- [19] Hossein Hosseini and Radha Poovendran. Semantic adversarial examples. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, CVPR Workshops 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 1614–1619. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [20] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens van der Maaten, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 2261–2269. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [21] Shize Huang, Xiaowen Liu, Xiaolu Yang, and Zhaoxin Zhang. An improved shapshifter method of generating adversarial examples for physical attacks on stop signs against faster r-cnns. *Comput. Secur.*, 104:102120, 2021.
- [22] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In Peter L. Bartlett, Fernando C. N. Pereira, Christopher J. C. Burges, Léon Bottou, and Kilian Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25: 26th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2012. Proceedings of a meeting held December 3-6, 2012, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States*, pages 1106–1114, 2012.
- [23] Alexey Kurakin, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial examples in the physical world. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Workshop Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [24] Juncheng Li, Frank R. Schmidt, and J. Zico Kolter. Adversarial camera stickers: A physical camera-based attack on deep learning systems. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3896–3904. PMLR, 2019.
- [25] Hsueh-Ti Derek Liu, Michael Tao, Chun-Liang Li, Derek Nowrouzezahrai, and Alec Jacobson. Beyond pixel norm-balls: Parametric adversaries using an analytically differentiable renderer. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [26] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- [27] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, Omar Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. Universal adversarial perturbations. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 86–94. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [28] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. Deepfool: A simple and accurate method to fool deep neural networks. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016*, pages 2574–2582. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [29] Dinh-Luan Nguyen, Sunpreet S. Arora, Yuhang Wu, and Hao Yang. Adversarial light projection attacks on face recognition systems: A feasibility study. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR Workshops 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 14-19, 2020*, pages 3548–3556. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [30] Mark Sandler, Andrew G. Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 4510–4520. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [31] Athena Sayles, Ashish Hooda, Mohit Gupta, Rahul Chatterjee, and Earlene Fernandes. Invisible perturbations: Physical adversarial examples exploiting the rolling shutter effect. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14666–14675, 2021.
- [32] Ali Shahin Shamsabadi, Ricardo Sánchez-Matilla, and Andrea Cavallaro. Colorfool: Semantic adversarial colorization. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020*, pages 1148–1157. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [33] Mahmood Sharif, Sruti Bhagavatula, Lujo Bauer, and Michael K. Reiter. Accessorize to a crime: Real and stealthy attacks on state-of-the-art face recognition. In Edgar R. Weippl, Stefan Katzenbeisser, Christopher Kruegel, Andrew C. Myers, and Shai Halevi, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Vienna, Austria, October 24-28, 2016*, pages 1528–1540. ACM, 2016.
- [34] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [35] Dawn Song, Kevin Eykholt, Ivan Evtimov, Earlene Fernandes, Bo Li, Amir Rahmati, Florian Tramèr, Atul Prakash, and Tadayoshi Kohno. Physical adversarial examples for object detectors. In Christian Rossow and Yves Younan, editors, *12th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies, WOOT 2018, Baltimore, MD, USA, August 13-14, 2018*. USENIX Association, 2018.
- [36] Jiawei Su, Danilo Vasconcellos Vargas, and Kouichi Sakurai. One pixel attack for fooling deep neural networks. *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 23(5):828–841, 2019.
- [37] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott E. Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2015, Boston, MA, USA, June 7-12, 2015*, pages 1–9. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.

- [38] Christian Szegedy, Vincent Vanhoucke, Sergey Ioffe, Jonathon Shlens, and Zbigniew Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016*, pages 2818–2826. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [39] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2014.
- [40] Donghua Wang, Tingsong Jiang, Jialiang Sun, Weien Zhou, Zhiqiang Gong, Xiaoya Zhang, Wen Yao, and Xiaoqian Chen. FCA: learning a 3d full-coverage vehicle camouflage for multi-view physical adversarial attack. In *Thirty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, Thirty-Fourth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2022, The Twelveth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2022 Virtual Event, February 22 - March 1, 2022*, pages 2414–2422. AAAI Press, 2022.
- [41] Jiakai Wang, Aishan Liu, Zixin Yin, Shunchang Liu, Shiyu Tang, and Xianglong Liu. Dual attention suppression attack: Generate adversarial camouflage in physical world. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2021, virtual, June 19-25, 2021*, pages 8565–8574. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2021.
- [42] Rey Wiyatno and Anqi Xu. Maximal jacobian-based saliency map attack. *CoRR*, abs/1808.07945, 2018.
- [43] Rey Wiyatno and Anqi Xu. Physical adversarial textures that fool visual object tracking. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2019, Seoul, Korea (South), October 27 - November 2, 2019*, pages 4821–4830. IEEE, 2019.
- [44] Cihang Xie, Zhishuai Zhang, Yuyin Zhou, Song Bai, Jianyu Wang, Zhou Ren, and Alan L. Yuille. Improving transferability of adversarial examples with input diversity. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 2730–2739. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019.
- [45] Kaidi Xu, Gaoyuan Zhang, Sijia Liu, Quanfu Fan, Mengshu Sun, Hongge Chen, Pin-Yu Chen, Yanzhi Wang, and Xue Lin. Adversarial t-shirt! evading person detectors in a physical world. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision - ECCV 2020 - 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part V*, volume 12350 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 665–681. Springer, 2020.
- [46] Xiaohui Zeng, Chenxi Liu, Yu-Siang Wang, Weichao Qiu, Lingxi Xie, Yu-Wing Tai, Chi-Keung Tang, and Alan L. Yuille. Adversarial attacks beyond the image space. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 4302–4311. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019.
- [47] Yang Zhang, Hassan Foroosh, Philip David, and Boqing Gong. CAMOU: learning physical vehicle camouflages to adversarially attack detectors in the wild. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [48] Zhengyu Zhao, Zhuoran Liu, and Martha A. Larson. Towards large yet imperceptible adversarial image perturbations with perceptual color distance. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020*, pages 1036–1045. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [49] Yiqi Zhong, Xianming Liu, Deming Zhai, Junjun Jiang, and Xiangyang Ji. Shadows can be dangerous: Stealthy and effective physical-world adversarial attack by natural phenomenon. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15345–15354, 2022.
- [50] Zhe Zhou, Di Tang, Xiaofeng Wang, Weili Han, Xiangyu Liu, and Kehuan Zhang. Invisible mask: Practical attacks on face recognition with infrared. *CoRR*, abs/1803.04683, 2018.