

NoisyHate: Benchmarking Content Moderation Machine Learning Models with Human-Written Perturbations Online

Yiran Ye
yby5204@psu.edu
Penn State University
University Park, PA, USA

Thai Le
thaile@olemiss.edu
University of Mississippi
Oxford, MS, USA

Dongwon Lee
dongwon@psu.edu
Penn State University
University Park, PA, USA

ABSTRACT

Online texts with toxic contents are a clear threat to the users on social media in particular and society in general. Although many platforms have adopted various measures (e.g., machine learning based hate-speech detection systems) to diminish their effect, toxic content writers have also attempted to evade such measures by using cleverly modified toxic words, so-called *human-written text perturbations*. Therefore, to help build AI-based detection to recognize those perturbations, prior methods have developed sophisticated techniques to generate diverse adversarial samples. However, we note that these algorithms-generated perturbations do not necessarily capture all the traits of human-written perturbations. Therefore, in this paper, we introduce a benchmark test set of human-written perturbations, named as NoisyHate, created from real perturbations written by human users on various social platforms, for helping develop better toxic speech detection models. Meanwhile, to check if our perturbation can be normalized to its clean version, we applied spell corrector algorithms on this dataset. Finally, we test this data on state-of-the-art language models, such as BERT and RoBERTa, and black box APIs, such as Perspective API, to demonstrate the adversarial attack with real human-written perturbations is still effective.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Security and privacy** → *Social aspects of security and privacy*;
• **Computing methodologies** → *Language resources*; • **Information systems** → *Social tagging*.

KEYWORDS

toxicity detection, social media, adversarial attack, crowd-sourcing

ACM Reference Format:

Yiran Ye, Thai Le, and Dongwon Lee. 2018. NoisyHate: Benchmarking Content Moderation Machine Learning Models with Human-Written Perturbations Online. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Hate speech, a conscious and willful public statement intended to defame a group of people, is always a threat on social media platforms that might cause cyberbullying. Many popular social media platforms, such as Twitter and Reddit, published specific hateful conduct policies and applied machine learning algorithms for hate speech detection to diminish its effects. Meanwhile, they also provide advanced muting options so that users can block the words they do not intend to see, such as those provided by Facebook and Twitter. However, trolls sometimes use another spelling of a potentially offensive word, such as text perturbation, to evade such hate speech detection systems. At the same time, a human being can still understand the meaning. These text perturbations have been produced in lots of different ways. One might use *visually similar* characters to replace the original alphabetical characters. For example, “ni66er” is commonly used to perturb the word “nigger”. Another perturbation strategy trolls are likely to use *repeating or removing* certain characters in a word, e.g., “bitch” → “bittch,” “stupid” → “stupd.” Other approaches to produce text perturbations include *placeholder* (“shit” → “sh_t”), *lower-upper-case* (“democrats” → “democRATs”), and the combination from any of the above approaches. These various text perturbations could be a problem that nullifies the effects of safeguard machine learning algorithms.

Existing works have developed many frameworks to automatically generate text perturbations to benchmark the robustness of machine learning algorithms [25, 32]. These frameworks often borrow several adversarial attack algorithms from NLP literature ([5, 12, 13, 21, 22, 26, 30, 31]). However, there is still a gap between those machine-generated perturbations and human-written perturbations [19]. Instead of augmenting datasets with machine-generated perturbations and using them for evaluating the robustness of machine learning algorithms, we suggest augmenting those datasets with human-written perturbations. Evaluating machine learning models using datasets augmented with human-written perturbations is more practical as it better reflects real-life scenarios. Hence, this paper proposes a benchmark dataset for the toxic speech detection task that contains diverse human-written perturbations online. The contributions of our work can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce a novel benchmark test set, NoisyHate, with online human-written perturbations for toxic speech detection models. This dataset is derived from the popular Jigsaw dataset¹ with toxicity labels and identity annotations.

¹<https://jigsaw.google.com/>

Original Sentence	Generated Adversarial Sample	Cited Perspective API score	Perspective API score in 2022
I think the 1 million sales is total bullshit though.	I think the 1 million sales is total bullshkt though.	0.79 → 0.07 [14]	0.55
Climate change is happening and it's not changing in our favor. If you think differently you're an idiot	Climate change is happening and it's not changing in our favor. If you think differently you're an idiit	0.84 → 0.20 [15]	0.88
Anyone who voted for Trump is a moron	Anyone who voted for Trump is a mo.ron	0.80 → 0.13 [15]	0.86
The irony of the crowd booing the women until corbyn gives them permission to cheer. Talk about deluded. Are the corbyn supporters really this stupid.	The irony of the crowd booing the women until ëörßyn gives them permission to cheer talk about deluded Are the corbyn supporters really this stupid.	0.92 → 0.27 [8]	0.74

Table 1: Comparison between old Perspective API score and current Perspective API score towards the same attack

- We test NoisyHate dataset with several spell checkers and show that it is worth developing a better normalization tool targeting these online human-written perturbations.
- Our evaluation with state-of-the-art (SOTA) language models and the commercial toxic detection *Perspective API*² on NoisyHate reveals that there are still room for improving the robustness of these models on predicting texts with human-written perturbations.

2 RELATED WORKS

We briefly go through two research areas closely related to our works: text perturbation generation algorithms and toxic speech detection.

2.1 Text Perturbation Generation

2.1.1 Machine Generated Text Perturbations. In literature, two major approaches are used to generate adversarial text sample: spelling modification [7, 11, 12, 15, 21] and close words substitution [5, 18, 27, 28]. The spelling modification approach usually involves deleting, inserting, swapping, and replacing certain characters in a word. Bhalerao et al. [7] proposed a tool named Continuous Word2Vec (CW2V) to perturb text with the following rules: Fake punctuation ("like" → "l.i.k.e"), Neighboring key ("like" → "lime"), Random spaces ("like" → "l ike"), Transposition ("share" → "sahre"), and Vowel repetition and deletion ("like" → "likee"). Other than changing the word's spelling directly, the second approach aims to replace the entire word with other regular English words to attack text classification models. Ribeiro et al.'s work [27] demonstrated the effectiveness of the attack with semantically equivalent adversarial rules (SEARs) on machine comprehension, visual question answering, and sentiment analysis tasks. SEARs are simple universal replacement rules intending to convert the target word into its semantically identical pairs ("what" → "which", "what is" → "what's"). Alzantot et al. [5] also introduced an adversarial attack method that replaces the target word with its top k nearest neighbors based on the distance in the GloVe embedding space. To make the perturbation types more diverse, Li et al. [21] developed TEXTBUGGER that applied both the spelling modification and close word substitution approaches. Nevertheless, experiment [19] involving human evaluation reveals that the distance between the perturbations generated by TEXTBUGGER and real Human-written Text Perturbations still exists. Moreover, since these adversarial samples are produced based on some known

vulnerabilities of a target model, how well they can help the hate-speech detection model prevent real-world attack are yet to be explored.

2.1.2 Human-written Text Perturbations. CRYPTeX [20] is a platform that retrieves human-written perturbations directly from social media, such as Reddit, and provides visualization on the trend of those perturbations. Meanwhile, it also offers an interface to perturb the user-inputted sentences randomly. Due to this Randomness, some insignificant words might be perturbed occasionally. For example, given a sentence, "I hate those stupid vegans", a perturbation on "I" or "those" might be insufficient to help this sentence evade the hate speech detection system. Moreover, the CRYPTeX is using the ANTHRO algorithm [19] to cluster the words and their perturbations in social media based on their sound and spelling composition (e.g., leading characters, vowels and consonants, and visually similar characters). Therefore, some different standard English words with the same pronunciation, such as "main" and "mam," will be treated as each other's perturbation. Hence, the randomly picked perturbation might not fit the context well.

2.2 Toxic Speech Detection

Barbieri et al. [6] applied state-of-the-art models, such as BERT, RoBERTa, LSTM, and SVM, on the TweetEval data set and reported that the best Macro F1 score on the test set is 0.829 (RoBERTa-Retrained) for offensive speech classification. Mathew et al. [24] introduced another dataset named HateXplain, and also trained language models, including BERT and BiRNN, on this dataset. According to their report, BERT demonstrated the best Macro F1 result, 0.687. Perspective API [3], created by Jigsaw and Google team, is one of the most famous black box toxic content detection systems. According to their website, their model was trained on millions of comments from various sources, including online forums such as Wikipedia and The New York Times, across various languages. Researchers also studied adversarial attacks targeting Perspective API [8, 14–16]. However, as the version iterates, Perspective API developed defensive strategies to thwart these machine-generated attacks. Table 1 presents the outcomes of today's Perspective API when facing previous effective attacks. It is still worthwhile to investigate the performance of these models when subjected to human-written perturbations.

3 NOISYHATE DATASET

3.1 Overview and Usage

This section introduces the transformation process of our dataset from the Jigsaw dataset's original texts to its current version. This

²<https://perspectiveapi.com/>




Figure 1: Overall curation pipeline of NoisyHate dataset. This pipeline has three steps: (1) Data sourcing and cleaning from the original Jigsaw dataset (Section 3.2), (2) Sentence perturbation with human-written perturbations via pseudo-random sampling (Section 3.3) and (3) Human evaluation via crowd-sourcing to validate the quality of the perturbed sentences (Section 3.4)

```

1 from datasets import load_dataset
2
3 URL = "yiran223/toxic-detection-testset-perturbations"
4 clean_set = load_dataset(URL, \
5     data_files={"clean": "data/clean.csv"})
6 clean_set = pd.DataFrame.from_dict(clean_set['clean'])
7
8 pert_set = load_dataset(URL, \
9     data_files={"pert": "data/pert.csv"})
10 pert_set = pd.DataFrame.from_dict(clean_set['clean'])

```

Figure 2: Python code for loading the NoisyHate datasets into a table using the Hugging Face API

transformation process includes three consecutive steps, namely (1) data pre-processing, (2) sentence perturbation using human-written perturbations, and (3) human evaluation via crowd-sourcing. Figure 1 reveals the overall pipeline of this procedure. Our data and the source code for all the following steps can be found at our repository page³. One can also use programming scripts to access our data through Hugging Face’s dataset repository⁴. Figure 2 demonstrates the code snippets to retrieve and load the NoisyHate into a table format using Python programming. This semi-automatic pipeline will also provide other researchers with resources such as user-study designs and interfaces to curate benchmark datasets with human-written perturbations in domains other than toxic text detection.

3.2 Data Source and Cleaning

Jigsaw is a famous toxic speech classification dataset containing approximately 2 million public comments from the Civil Comments platform. In addition to the toxic score labels for toxicity classification, the Jigsaw dataset also provides several toxicity sub-type dimensions which indicate particular comment’s target groups, such as male, female, black, and Asian. Due to these prolific identity annotations and significant data volume, we adopt this dataset as our raw data source. Since the dataset has been used as the standard benchmark dataset for content moderation tasks, this adoption will also help reduce the entry barrier in adopting NoisyHate from the community.

³<https://github.com/YiranYe/toxic-detection-testset>

⁴<https://huggingface.co/datasets>

Algorithm 1 Perturbing Process

Require: Clean Sentence $S_{clean} = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]$, Bert model B , Perturbations Generated by the ANTHOR Algorithm $Dict$: $(w, [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t])$, Output Size k , Threshold Θ

Ensure: Perturbed Sentence list $\mathbb{S}_{pert} = [S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k]$

```

1:  $\mathbb{S}_{pert} = []$ 
2:  $Score_{origin} = B(S_{clean})$ 
3: for  $w_i$  in  $S_{clean}$  do
4:    $Score_{mask_i} = B([w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{i-1}, w_{i+1}, \dots, w_n])$ 
5:   if  $abs(Score_{origin} - Score_{mask_i}) > \Theta$  then
6:     for  $p_j$  in  $random.sample(Dict_{hard}[w_i], k)$  do
7:        $\mathbb{S}_{pert} += [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{i-1}, p_j, w_{i+1}, \dots, w_n]$ 
8:     end for
9:   end if
10: end for

```

Since the comments from the Jigsaw dataset contain a lot of special characters, emojis, and informal languages, data cleaning was necessary to ensure data quality. Following a typical text processing pipeline, we removed duplicated texts, special characters, special punctuation, hyperlinks, and numbers. Since we only focused on English texts, sentences containing non-standard English words were filtered out. 13,182 texts remained after this step.

3.3 Sentence Perturbation

In this step, we aim to perturb each of the texts resulting from the previous step with human-written perturbations. Algorithm 1 is the pseudo-code of this process. Since we focus on benchmarking toxic text detection tasks, it is practical and meaningful to perturb only a few critical words within a sentence. To do this, we first train a proxy toxic detection model and utilize it to approximate the importance of each word to toxicity detection. In particular, we first fine-tune a BERT model [10] on the Jigsaw dataset. Then, we enumerate and mask every word in each sentence and observe how much confidence of the trained model changes after the such masking operation (Algorithm 1, Line 4–Line 9). A candidate word is selected to be perturbed at every enumeration step if masking decreases the proxy model’s confidence more than a pre-determined threshold (Algorithm 1, Line 5).

Type	Description	Example
RepeatChar	repeat several characters	stupid→stuppppid
Abbr	delete several characters	stupid→stupd
SpecialChar	replace several characters with Non-English characters	stupid→5tupid stupid→st*pid
MixedCase	replace several characters with their upper cases	stupid→sTuPID
MixedCase+	replace several characters with their upper cases, while these characters can be combined into a new word	stupid→stuPiD


Table 2: We categorize all human-written perturbations to five different groups according to five perturbation strategies that curate them.

A sentence might have more than one crucial words. However, perturbing all of them will increase the chance that the perturbed sentence will be discarded in the crowd-sourcing step. This can happen because even one poorly perturbed word can lead to the discard of the whole sentence by the crowd-sourced workers. Thus, to maximize the number of sentences that remained at the end, we take a conservation measure and only perturb the most important word in a given sentence. Then, we utilize the ANTHRO algorithm [19], which applies a customized version of the Soundex algorithm that can provide the cluster of online human-written perturbations for a given word, to retrieve the perturbations from social media on the selected important words.


Different types of human-written perturbations exist according to the perturbation strategies that curate them. To categorize all the perturbations used in this step, we classify them into five different perturbation strategies. Table 2 presents the definition of those types and examples. They are (1) repeating characters (RepeatChar), (2) using abbreviation by removing one or several characters (Abbr), (3) using non-English or special characters (SpecialChar), (4) using mixed cased characters (MixedCase) and (5) using mixed cased characters with an additional layer of meaning (e.g., “republicans”→“repubLIecans”) (MixedCase+). Due to the imbalanced frequency distribution among different perturbation strategies, ANTHRO algorithm [19] is biased to a specific type of perturbation such as RepeatChar. Hence, To increase the diversity of different perturbation types in NoisyHate dataset, we apply a pseudo-random strategy to give a higher chance for perturbation types with less frequency to be sampled. We utilized this procedure with ten random seeds and chose the best distribution entropy. This step results in 2,120 sentences.

3.4 Human Evaluation

With the dataset of perturbed sentences prepared in Section 3.3, we now proceed to the human evaluation step that involves Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) workers in judging the generated perturbation’s quality. This step is necessary to ensure that the select perturbations in the previous step (Section 3.3) are appropriate to the sentences’ contexts. Before MTurk workers work on their tasks, we provide brief training to the workers. To do this, we



(a) Percentage of perturbation remained across all five perturbation types.



(b) Perturbation type distribution

Figure 3: Comparison of distribution of different perturbation categories before and after validated by human workers (Section 3.4). “Raw” refers to the original data we send to MTurk workers, and “preserved” refers to the number/percentage saved after human evaluation.

display a guideline in Table 4 (Appendix) to explain the definition of human-generated perturbation and provide examples of both high-quality and low-quality perturbations. This training phase has been suggested to warrant high-quality responses from the human worker, especially for labeling tasks [9]. Each MTurk worker is then presented with a pair of a perturbed sentences and its clean version and is asked to determine the quality of the perturbed one (Figure 5, Appendix).

We recruited five different workers from the North America region through five assignments to assess each pair. A five-second countdown timer was also set for each task to ensure workers spent enough time on it. To ensure the quality of their responses, we designed an attention question that asks them to click on the perturbed word in the given sentences before they provide their quality ratings (Figure 5, Appendix). Workers who cannot correctly identify the perturbation’s location in the given sentence will be blocked for future batches. We aimed to pay the workers at an average rate of \$10 per hour, which is well above the federal minimum wage (\$7.25 per hour). The payment of each task was estimated by the average length of the sentences, which totals around 25 words per pair, and the average reading speed of native speakers is around 228 words per minute [29].

By removing tasks that failed to identify the location of the perturbed words accurately, the data was reduced from 2120 to 1707. Subsequently, approximately 78.4% (1339) of the remaining data were deemed high-quality perturbations and retained for further analysis. Figure 3 presents the distribution of high-quality perturbations across five categories. MixedCase+ category (e.g.,

Spell Corrector	RepeatChar	Abbr	SpecialChar	MixedCase	MixedCase+	Overall Accuracy
Google SerpApi	0.698	0.751	0.322	0.934	0.954	0.755
Bing API	0.406	0.533	0.426	0.943	0.963	0.633
pyspellchecker	0.544	0.480	0.809	0.948	0.954	0.728
NeuSpell	0.294	0.550	0.448	0.867	0.931	0.583

Table 3: Perturbation Normalization Accuracy

“republicans”→“repubLIecans”) had the highest retention rate, with 88.8% of perturbed sentences retained. Conversely, MTurk workers discarded more than 30% of perturbed sentences containing abbreviation perturbations or special characters—the outcome of our study aligned with our initial expectations. The generation of MixedCase+ perturbations typically requires human insights and understanding of outside contexts that are not accessible by machines, which then makes it more acceptable to humans. In contrast, both abbreviation-based perturbations (Abbr) and perturbations utilizing special characters (SpecialChar) result in character loss, making it more challenging for humans to associate the perturbed sentence with its clean version.

4 GENERALIZABILITY TO OTHER TASKS

The workflow presented in this study can be applied to curate datasets of various NLP tasks. Specifically, this section will focus on two case studies, sentiment analysis, and machine translation, and briefly discuss the importance and feasibility of integrating the proposed pipeline into these tasks.

- *Sentiment Analysis.* Sentiment analysis uses models to identify the emotional tone, opinion, or attitude expressed in a given input sentence. Sentiment analysis is frequently utilized to monitor social media platforms to understand public opinion about a particular topic, brand, or event. However, since human-written perturbations are present on social media platforms such as Reddit [19], the accuracy of a sentiment analysis model can be demised by such perturbations in real-world settings. To tackle this, our proposed pipeline can be extended to generate or synthesize difficult training examples to improve existing sentiment analysis models or benchmark their robustness.
- *Machine Translation.* Machine Translation is a valuable tool that facilitates cross-cultural communication and enhances understanding on social media platforms. It enables non-native speakers to connect with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and gain insights into global issues and perspectives. Nonetheless, human-written perturbations can pose challenges for translators and contribute to language barriers for non-native speakers. This is particularly true when such individuals cannot relate the perturbation to its original word. Our pipeline can be extended to validate the performance of the machine translation model on noisy text.

The users can also use our pipeline to add human-written perturbations to another source dataset different from the Jigsaw dataset. First, the pipeline can be applied to clean the data and then use state-of-the-art language models to find the important words. Two approaches can then be employed to obtain related perturbations

for these words. The first approach is to directly use the API provided by CRYPTeX [20], which utilize ANTHRO [19] behind the scene. By inputting a given word into the API, it returns a set of human-written perturbations of that word. Alternatively, suppose we want to restrict the perturbations to only those in a selected corpus. In that case, we can implement the second approach, which clusters perturbations of words in the given corpus using the ANTHRO algorithm [19]. Finally, crowd-sourcing can be employed to filter out low-quality data using the provided user-study training examples and designs (Table 4, Figure 5, Appendix)

5 BASELINE

This section will demonstrate some of the baseline performances on NoisyHate’s dataset on two natural language processing tasks that correspond to two research questions.

RQ. 1. *Can NoisyHate’s perturbed sentence be restored to its clean version by some normalization algorithms such as misspelling corrector?* Answers to this question can demonstrate the novelty of the proposed human-written perturbations.

RQ. 2. *Can NoisyHate’s perturbed sentence effectively attack state-of-the-art language-model-based and commercial toxic detection models?* Answers to this question can demonstrate the potential impact of NoisyHate dataset on improving future toxic text detection models.

5.1 Perturbations Normalization

To answer the first question, we select one word-level spell corrector: pyspellchecker [4], one open source deep learning model-based spell corrector: NeuSpell [17], and two commercial APIs: Google Search SerpApi [2] and Bing Spell Checker API [1]. We detailed these spell correctors below.

- *pyspellchecker.* pyspellchecker, the python package, is a word-level spell checker that returns the target word w ’s most likely permutations within a predefined Levenshtein Distance. This likelihood for a candidate permutation c is calculated based on the multiplication of its word frequency, $P(c)$, and the probability that the w is typed when the author meant to type the candidate c , $P(w|c)$.
- *NeuSpell.* NeuSpell is an open-source toolkit for sentence-level spelling correction. It contains ten language models, including CNN-LSTM, Nested-LSTM and BERT. We test all these models on our dataset and select the model with the best performance.
- *Google Search SerpApi* Google Search provides “Did you mean?” suggestions when a user input a sentence with spelling errors in its search bar. SerpApi extracts these suggestions and returns them as a spell-checker API.




Figure 4: Model Accuracy vs Threshold Curve

- *Bing Spell Checker API*. The Bing Spell Checker API utilizes statistical machine translation and machine learning algorithms to deliver precise and contextual corrections. According to their website, it can recognize and normalize slang, informal language, and different words with the same sounds (“see” and “sea”).

Since NoisyHate’s perturbed sentences contain lowercase and uppercase characters. At the same time, our clean set only has lowercase characters; some spell correctors might choose to retain the letter case (e.g., “Stupiid” will be corrected as “Stupid” instead of “stupid”), a corrected word with uppercase characters might be treated as failure even if it has the same spelling as the clean word. In this case, we convert the corrected word into lowercase before comparison. Noticeably, this operation might reduce the toxicity of certain words (“democRATs”→“democrats”). Table 3 summarizes the accuracy of these spell checkers on NoisyHate. One of the commercial APIs, Google Search, presents the best result. However, the word-level spell corrector, pyspellchecker, has the second-highest accuracy. One possible explanation for this observation is that, for an inputted non-English word, the pyspellchecker always offered its best guess even if the calculated probability of typos was low, while other tools remained conservative with a small confidence value. In practice, these spell checkers might encounter more complex and novel perturbations. This result calls for continuous improvement of normalization tools targeting human-written perturbations online.

5.2 Perturbations Understanding

For RQ. 2., we tested the BERT model [10], RoBERTa model [23] and also the Perspective API on NoisyHate dataset. Then, we compared their performance when tested on clean and perturbed sentences. Since all of the data in our NoisyHate dataset are positive examples (i.e., toxicity ≥ 0.5 in the original Jigsaw dataset), the model’s classification accuracy depends on a pre-defined decision threshold t . Typically, $t=k$ means that the input will be considered toxic if the confidence of a model’s prediction for this data is larger than k , and vice versa. To better capture the performance differences among different threshold values, we plot the model accuracy vs. threshold curve as shown in Figure 4.

According to Figure 4, suppose we choose $t=0.5$; the RoBERTa-TweetEval model has the best performance ($Acc_{t=0.5}=0.915$) on the clean set while the Perspective API has the worst performance ($Acc_{t=0.5}=0.814$). However, the perspective API achieves the best overall robustness compared to other models, according to Figure 4. In the perturbed dataset, the accuracy of the Perspective API’s classification when $t=0.5$ is 0.672, it is much higher than the second best model, BERT model ($Acc_{t=0.5}=0.557$).

6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

This work presents a novel benchmark dataset with annotated toxicity labels and identity information. This dataset consists of clean data and its corresponding perturbed version with online human-written text perturbations. It allows researchers to evaluate the effectiveness of their proposed toxic content detection models in the face of real-world human-generated attacks. Furthermore, the diverse types of perturbations in the dataset pose a challenge for perturbation normalization algorithms. However, the toxicity of a sentence can evolve. For instance, words that may have been considered neutral several decades ago, such as “retarded” may be perceived as toxic in contemporary times. Also, people might generate more interesting perturbations in the future. It depends on some events, online memes, and even TikTok videos. In order to address this issue, we aim to develop a model that can distinguish high-quality perturbations based on the annotated data we collected from Amazon MTurk. This model will enable us to automate the perturbation process, ensuring that the perturbations remain timely and relevant.

APPENDIX

Table 4 demonstrates the guideline and examples used for training MTurk workers for the human evaluation step (Section 3.4). Figure 5 also illustrates the interactive user-study designs employed to validate the quality of perturbed sentences.

Section	Instruction
Definition	What is a human written text perturbation? A human written text perturbation is an alternative of a standard English word that is usually invented by netizens. The purpose of a perturbation can be: 1. avoiding platforms' filtering: ass → a55; Russian → Russ!an 2. visual attraction: bro → brooooooooo; porn → pornnnnnnn 3. memes: republican + lie → republIEcan; democrat → democRAT
	Perturbations that are LIKELY to be written by human: Example 1: Clean Sentence: keeping <u>russian</u> invaders warm in these frigid temperatures Perturbed Sentence: keeping <u>russ!an</u> invaders warm in these frigid temperatures Example 2: Clean Sentence: our <u>country</u> is a cesspool Perturbed Sentence: our countrrry is a cesspool
Examples	Perturbations that are UNLIKELY to be written by human: Example 1: Clean Sentence: <u>damn</u> you beat me to it Perturbed Sentence: <u>dawn</u> you beat me to it Example 2: Clean Sentence: they were pretty <u>cool</u> to me when i was there Perturbed Sentence: they were pretty <u>coll</u> to me when i was there

Table 4: Guideline for MTurk Workers

Please compare this sentence with the provided clean version carefully, and complete the provided questions.

Warning! There are several hidden control tasks, if your responses are far away from the right answers, the system will automatically REJECT your assignments.

Question 1. Please identify via mouse-click one possible perturbation in the following sentences.

Clean Sentence:i guess you know **some** pretty stupid young people you are the company you keep

Perturbed Sentence:i guess you know **some** pretty Stuuupidd young people you are the company you keep

Question 2. Choose from a scale from 1 to 5, how likely is the observed perturbation substitutable with its clean version (i.e., can evade hate speech detection systems with similar meaning/sound, but different spellings)?

Please try to avoid selecting the neutral response, blind selection of the neutral responses might also cause REJECTION!

☐ 1 - Very unlikely ☐ 2 - Unlikely ☐ 3 - Fair ☐ 4 - Likely ☐ 5 - Very likely

2(s) remaining

Figure 5: Human evaluation Interface: a clean-perturbed word pair will be highlighted when the worker moves the mouse cursor over one of them. By clicking the highlighted word, the worker commits that this is the identified clean-perturbed pair.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2022. *Bing Spell Check API*. Retrieved Jan 30, 2022 from <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/bing/apis/bing-spell-check-api>
- [2] 2022. *Google Spell Check API*. Retrieved Jan 30, 2022 from <https://serpapi.com/spell-check>
- [3] 2022. *Perspective API*. Retrieved Jan 30, 2022 from <https://perspectiveapi.com/>
- [4] 2022. *pyspellchecker*. Retrieved Jan 30, 2022 from <https://pyspellchecker.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>
- [5] Moustafa Alzantot, Yash Sharma, Ahmed Elgohary, Bo-Jhang Ho, Mani Srivastava, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. Generating natural language adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07998* (2018).
- [6] Francesco Barbieri, Jose Camacho-Collados, Luis Espinosa-Anke, and Leonardo Neves. 2020. TweetEval: Unified Benchmark and Comparative Evaluation for Tweet Classification. In *Proceedings of Findings of EMNLP*.
- [7] Rasika Bhalerao, Mohammad Al-Rubaie, Anand Bhaskar, and Igor Markov. 2022. Data-Driven Mitigation of Adversarial Text Perturbation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09483* (2022).
- [8] Stephan Brown, Petar Milkov, Sameep Patel, Yi Zen Looi, Ziqian Dong, Huanying Gu, N Sertac Artan, and Edwin Jain. 2019. Acoustic and visual approaches to adversarial text generation for google perspective. In *2019 International Conference on Computational Science and Computational Intelligence (CSCI)*. IEEE, 355–360.
- [9] Elizabeth Clark, Tal August, Sofia Serrano, Nikita Haduong, Suchin Gururangan, and Noah A Smith. 2021. All that's human is not gold: Evaluating human evaluation of generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00061* (2021).
- [10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT'19*. 4171–4186.
- [11] Steffen Eger, Gözde Gül Şahin, Andreas Rücklé, Ji-Ung Lee, Claudia Schulz, Mohsen Mesgar, Krishnkant Swarnkar, Edwin Simpson, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Text processing like humans do: Visually attacking and shielding NLP systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11508* (2019).
- [12] Ji Gao, Jack Lanchantin, Mary Lou Soffa, and Yanjun Qi. 2018. Black-box generation of adversarial text sequences to evade deep learning classifiers. In *2018 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 50–56.
- [13] Siddhant Garg and Goutham Ramakrishnan. 2020. BAE: BERT-based Adversarial Examples for Text Classification. *EMNLP'20* (2020).
- [14] Yotam Gil, Yoav Chai, Or Gorodissky, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. White-to-black: Efficient distillation of black-box adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02405* (2019).
- [15] Hossein Hosseini, Sreeram Kannan, Baosen Zhang, and Radha Poovendran. 2017. Deceiving google's perspective api built for detecting toxic comments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08138* (2017).
- [16] Edwin Jain, Stephan Brown, Jeffery Chen, Erin Neaton, Mohammad Baidas, Ziqian Dong, Huanying Gu, and Nabi Sertac Artan. 2018. Adversarial text generation for google's perspective api. In *2018 international conference on computational science and computational intelligence (CSCI)*. IEEE, 1136–1141.
- [17] Sai Muralidhar Jayanthi, Danish Pruthi, and Graham Neubig. 2020. NeuSpell: A Neural Spelling Correction Toolkit. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 158–164. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.21>
- [18] Di Jin, Zhijiang Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Is bert really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 8018–8025.
- [19] Thai Le, Jooyoung Lee, Kevin Yen, Yifan Hu, and Dongwon Lee. 2022. Perturbations in the Wild: Leveraging Human-Written Text Perturbations for Realistic Adversarial Attack and Defense. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. 2953–2965.
- [20] Thai Le, Ye Yiran, Yifan Hu, and Dongwon Lee. 2023. CRYPTTEXT: Database and Interactive Toolkit of Human-Written Text Perturbations in the Wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.06494* (2023).
- [21] Jinfeng Li, Shouling Ji, Tianyu Du, Bo Li, and Ting Wang. 2018. TextBugger: Generating Adversarial Text Against Real-world Applications. *NDSS'18* (2018).
- [22] Linyang Li, Ruotian Ma, Qipeng Guo, Xiangyang Xue, and Xipeng Qiu. 2020. Bert-attack: Adversarial attack against bert using bert. *EMNLP'20* (2020).
- [23] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [24] Binny Mathew, Punyajoy Saha, Seid Muhie Yimam, Chris Biemann, Pawan Goyal, and Animesh Mukherjee. 2021. Hatexplain: A benchmark dataset for explainable hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 14867–14875.
- [25] John Morris, Eli Lifland, Jin Yong Yoo, Jake Grigsby, Di Jin, and Yanjun Qi. 2020. TextAttack: A Framework for Adversarial Attacks, Data Augmentation, and Adversarial Training in NLP. In *EMNLP'19*.
- [26] Shuhuai Ren, Yihe Deng, Kun He, and Wanxiang Che. 2019. Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency. In *ACL'19*. 1085–1097.
- [27] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2018. Semantically equivalent adversarial rules for debugging NLP models. In *Proceedings of the 56th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: long papers)*. 856–865.
- [28] Motoki Sato, Jun Suzuki, Hiroyuki Shindo, and Yuji Matsumoto. 2018. Interpretable adversarial perturbation in input embedding space for text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.02917* (2018).
- [29] Susanne Trauzettel-Klosinski, Klaus Dietz, IReST Study Group, et al. 2012. Standardized assessment of reading performance: The new international reading speed texts IReST. *Investigative ophthalmology & visual science* 53, 9 (2012), 5452–5461.
- [30] Xiaoyong Yuan, Pan He, Qile Zhu, and Xiaolin Li. 2019. Adversarial examples: Attacks and defenses for deep learning. *IEEE transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 30, 9 (2019), 2805–2824.
- [31] Yuan Zang, Fanchao Qi, Chenghao Yang, Zhiyuan Liu, Meng Zhang, Qun Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2020. Word-level textual adversarial attacking as combinatorial optimization. In *ACL'20*. 6066–6080.
- [32] Guoyang Zeng, Fanchao Qi, Qianrui Zhou, Tingji Zhang, Bairu Hou, Yuan Zang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2021. Openattack: An open-source textual adversarial attack toolkit. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-demo.43>