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Abstract
Adversarial training, especially projected gradient descent (PGD), has been a successful approach for improving robustness against adversarial attacks. After adversarial training, gradients of models with respect to their inputs have a preferential direction. However, the direction of alignment is not mathematically well established, making it difficult to evaluate quantitatively. We propose a novel definition of this direction as the direction of the vector pointing toward the closest point of the support of the closest inaccurate class in decision space. To evaluate the alignment with this direction after adversarial training, we apply a metric that uses generative adversarial networks to produce the smallest residual needed to change the class present in the image. We show that PGD-trained models have a higher alignment than the baseline according to our definition, that our metric presents higher alignment values than a competing metric formulation, and that enforcing this alignment increases the robustness of models.

1. Introduction
Deep learning models have been shown to suffer from a lack of robustness against directed attacks that produce only small perturbations to the original input (Goodfellow et al., 2015). Several attacks of varying strengths have been proposed (Xu et al., 2020). To solve the lack of robustness, researchers have proposed several methods for defending against such attacks (Xu et al., 2020). These defenses include, for instance, training using adversarial examples as samples (Goodfellow et al., 2015; Madry et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2019), preprocessing input data (Guo et al., 2018; Samangouei et al., 2018; Nandy et al., 2020), regularizing gradients (Lyu et al., 2015; Hein & Andriushchenko, 2017; Ross & Doshi-Velez, 2018; Jakubovitz & Giryes, 2021), and detecting adversarial attacks (Carlini & Wagner, 2017b). One of the most successful defenses in terms of resisting new attacks (Carlini et al., 2017; Athalye et al., 2018) is projected gradient descent (PGD) training (Madry et al., 2018).

PGD has been shown to change the gradient of the loss function of a trained model with respect to inputs \( x \) (Tsipras et al., 2019). Other robust training techniques also induce similar changes, modifying the gradient of the logits of the output class (Etthmann et al., 2019; Kaur et al., 2019). We focus our studies on PGD due to its success and widespread use (Carlini et al., 2017; Madry et al., 2018; Athalye et al., 2018), but our theoretical analysis is generic for any robust model. Only a few quantitative studies have related gradient direction to robustness. We propose a novel definition for this direction in classification problems. We formulate a gradient alignment metric \( \alpha_{\Delta x} \) for a given sample \( x \) as the expected cosine similarity between \( \nabla \ell(x) \) and \( \Delta x \). We define \( \nabla \ell(x) \) as the gradient with respect to input \( x \) of the function \( \ell(x) \), related to the logits of a model and defined later in the paper, and \( \Delta x \) as the vector pointing from \( x \) to its closest neighbor \( x' \) in the support of class \( \hat{c}(x) \). The class \( \hat{c}(x) \) is the closest to \( x \) in decision space that is not its ground truth class.

We start by analyzing the robustness of models in a toy dataset where the data for each class lies in one of two concentric spheres, inspired by the work of Gilmer et al. (2018). The dataset was used by Gilmer et al. (2018) to demonstrate that non-zero generalization error can be the only cause of adversarial examples. Nonetheless, we use the dataset to prove a proportional relation between robustness and the proposed alignment metric. The theorems used for this proof are generic for multiclass classification problems, assuming local linearity and specific characteristics of the data distribution. Since \( x' \) is not straightforward to calculate for complex datasets, we also propose two methods to calculate an approximation \( x' \) by applying generative adversarial training (Goodfellow et al., 2014). We proceed to evaluate if the metric provides information for more complex datasets. Our results show that even though the most robust model did not always match the model with closer alignment, compared to a baseline, robust models trained with PGD have
a larger average \( \alpha_{\Delta x} \), and models trained using \( \alpha_{\Delta x} \) for enforcing a penalty on its gradient have higher robustness. Furthermore, the proposed metric show a closer alignment for robust models than an existing alignment metric proposed by Etmann et al. (2019).

1.1. Related work

Etmann et al. (2019) mathematically defined the alignment of gradients after robust training as the alignment between the input image \( x \) and the gradient of the logits of the output class \( m(x) \) with respect to \( x \), \( \nabla \logit(x)_{m(x)} \). Robustness is shown to be bounded by the sum of the given metric with other terms related to gradients and internal bias weights. However, the theoretical approach for the bias terms in the linear approximation of a model leads to a relatively loose bound in the relationship between robustness and alignment. We compare the metric proposed by Etmann et al. (2019) against our metric and demonstrate that ours presents a closer alignment in practice. In analyses of Ilyas et al. (2019) and Tanay & Griffin (2016), the gradient of robust models is shown to be better aligned with the vector connecting the centroid of two classes than the gradients of non-robust models. However, this finding is restricted to binary linear models. The complex boundaries of piece-wise linear deep learning models are unlikely to benefit from pointing in a single direction over the entire support of classes in high-dimensional datasets. Using local information of projection to the support of the opposite class, as we propose, is required to get flexible directions for each locally linear region of the model.

To study the gradients’ alignment, we introduce a metric and propose to evaluate its correlation with robustness. Other metrics with similar motivations have been studied. The local linearity measure (LLM) (Qin et al., 2019), for which a low value represents high local linearity of models around data points, is inversely correlated with the number of iterations in PGD. The metric was not evaluated directly against robustness, despite its potential. The CLEVER metric (Weng et al., 2018) uses an estimated extreme value for the Lipschitz constant of the model to calculate a lower bound for robustness without having to perform evaluation attacks. This metric complements ours because it evaluates gradient magnitude instead of gradient direction.

We propose a penalty on the direction of \( \nabla_{\ell(x)} \). This proposal adds to the literature of gradient penalties for robustness. Regularizing the gradient of a model with respect to its inputs has repeatedly been shown to increase its robustness (Lyu et al., 2015; Ross & Doshi-Velez, 2018; Hein & Andriushchenko, 2017; Jakubovitz & Giryes, 2018; Finlay & Oberman, 2021). However, this penalty does not penalize the direction of the gradient. The local linearity regularizer (LLR) (Qin et al., 2019) was proposed and combined with PGD to allow faster training. Given that \( \ell(x) \) is the cross-entropy loss function, this penalty is equivalent to enforcing the \( \nabla \ell(x) \) vector to be constant around data samples. However, the penalty enforces no direction. A penalty for aligning \( \nabla \logit(x)_{m(x)} \) with \( x \) was proposed by Etmann et al. (2019), only as a future work. An analogous penalty was proposed by Chan et al. (2020b). The alignment proposed by Noack et al. (2021) enforces the proximity between a saliency map of the non-robust model generated through SmoothGrad (Smilkov et al., 2017), a visual attribution technique, and \( \nabla \logit(x)_y \), where \( y \) is the ground truth class for \( x \). No theoretical justification for the choice of direction generated through such a technique was given.

Other works study the relationship between a model’s gradient and its robustness without directly studying the direction to which the gradient aligns. The method proposed by Chan et al. (2020a) transfers robustness from one model trained with PGD to other models by enforcing similar \( \nabla \ell(x) \). Boopathy et al. (2020) show that using their method to train models to have robust interpretation saliency maps indirectly leads to robust classification decisions. Helland & VanHoudnos (2020) qualitatively indicates that the gradient changes when performing robust training are a consequence of smoothness regularization over a model’s decision functions in conjunction with the decision boundary orientation caused by conventional classification losses.

2. Approach

2.1. Motivation and formulation of alignment metric

The robustness of a decision model \( m \) at a specific point \( x \) can be defined as the signed distance of \( x \) to the closest point where it is associated with a different model output. Formally, we define

\[
\rho(x) = \begin{cases} 
\inf\{\|\delta\|_p : m(x + \delta) \neq y\}, & \text{if } m(x) = y \\
-\inf\{\|\delta\|_p : m(x + \delta) = y\}, & \text{if } m(x) \neq y 
\end{cases}
\]

(1)

where \( \rho(x) \) is the robustness of \( m \) against adversarial attacks at point \( x \), and \( y \) is the ground truth class associated with \( x \). We set a negative distance for misclassified examples to penalize errors and prevent models with a trivial decision boundary, i.e., one that always assigns the same class, to have infinite expected robustness. For this analysis, we will use the \( L^2 \) norm, i.e., \( p = 2 \).

We analyze the Spheres dataset proposed by Gilmer et al. (2018) to hypothesize about a specific aspect of robustness: the association between the robustness of a decision model and the direction of the gradient of its logits with respect to its inputs. We use this dataset because its simplicity allows for a more accessible analysis, while Deep ReLU
networks can still fail in modeling it robustly (Gilmer et al., 2018). The Spheres dataset is composed of two classes with support on the surface of two hyperspheres, of radius 1.0 (class -1) and 1.3 (class 1), in a 500-dimensional space. The prior probability for each class is 0.5, and the distribution of samples is uniform on each hypersphere surface. We use the term support of a class $c$ as defined by supp$_c = \{ x \in X \mid P(x|y = c) > 0 \}$, where $X$ is the domain of inputs.

For this dataset, the optimally robust model $m_p$ has its decision rule defined by

$$c = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } \|x\|_2 > t \\
-1, & \text{if } \|x\|_2 < t 
\end{cases}, \quad t = 1.15. \quad (2)$$

This model has a margin of 0.15 between the decision boundary and any data point. Note that the expected robustness $E_{x \sim X} [\rho(x)]$ is the same for all values of $t$, and the decision to choose $t = 1.15$ is based on classification margins. A differentiable decision model can be obtained by defining logit$(x)_c = \|x\|_2 - 1.15$ and logit$(x)_{-1} = -\|x\|_2 + 1.15$, where logit$(x)_c$ is the logit of a model for class $c$ and input $x$. If we define a loss for the model as $-y \times \text{logit}(x)_1 + y \times \text{logit}(x)_0$, this model has radial gradients with respect to the input. The gradients of the decision loss point toward the origin for class 1 and away from the origin for class -1. We note that the optimally robust model has gradients that point from the support of one class to the closest point $x'$ of the support of the other class. We denote the vector connecting $x$ to $x'$ as $\Delta x$. We will proceed to theoretically justify the importance of $\Delta x$ and $\alpha$, in a 500-dimensional space. The model has a margin of 0.15 between the decision boundary and any data point. Note that the expected robustness $E_{x \sim X} [\rho(x)]$ is the same for all values of $t$, and the decision to choose $t = 1.15$ is based on classification margins. A differentiable decision model can be obtained by defining logit$(x)_1 = \|x\|_2 - 1.15$ and logit$(x)_{-1} = -\|x\|_2 + 1.15$, where logit$(x)_c$ is the logit of a model for class $c$ and input $x$. If we define a loss for the model as $-y \times \text{logit}(x)_1 + y \times \text{logit}(x)_0$, this model has radial gradients with respect to the input. The gradients of the decision loss point toward the origin for class 1 and away from the origin for class -1. We note that the optimally robust model has gradients that point from the support of one class to the closest point $x'$ of the support of the other class. We denote the vector connecting $x$ to $x'$ as $\Delta x$. We will proceed to theoretically justify the importance of $\Delta x$.

Lemma 1 follows from Lemma 1 proposed and proved by Ettemann et al. (2019). They also empirically showed that, despite $R(x) \geq |\rho(x)|$ not holding, the linearization is a good approximation. We will refer to models satisfying the assumption in Lemma 1 as being locally linear around $x$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\text{sim}(u, v)$ be the alignment between vectors $u$ and $v$, defined by their cosine similarity $\text{sim}(u, v) = \frac{u \cdot v}{\|u\|_2 \|v\|_2}$, let $m$ be a classification model and let $c^*(x) := \text{argmin}_{c \neq m(x)} \{ \|v\|_2 : m(x + v) = c \}$. For a pair of input examples $x_i$ and $x_j$, of different classes $i$ and $j$, respectively, around which $m$ is locally linear and for which $1 \{ c^*(x_i), m(x_i) \} = \{ i, j \}$ and $1 \{ c^*(x_j), m(x_j) \} = \{ i, j \}$, the combined robustness $\rho(x_i) + \rho(x_j)$ of $m$ is directly proportional to $\alpha$ according to $\rho(x_i) + \rho(x_j) = \|x_j - x_i\|_2 \alpha$, where $\alpha = \text{sim}(x_j - x_i, \nabla \text{logit}(x_j) - \nabla \text{logit}(x_i))$.

**Theorem 1** establishes that, given assumptions of local linearity and symmetry of closest decision boundaries, the sum of the robustness of two inputs, for which either the model’s output or the closest class is the ground truth for that example, is proportional to the alignment between model gradient and a vector connecting both inputs. The proof for Theorem 1 is in Section A.2 in the Supplementary Material. An illustration of the theorem claim for the Spheres dataset is given in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Illustration of the result from Theorem 1 for the Spheres dataset. The green straight line represents the decision boundary of an arbitrary classifier, and the purple top and brown bottom arcs represent a section of the support of classes 1 and -1, respectively. The cosine of the angle between the normal of the decision boundary ($\omega$) and the vector connecting both input samples ($\Delta x$) is proportional to the sum of robustnesses of both input samples.](image-url)
Theorem 2. Assuming that, for a multi-class dataset of classes \( C \),

1. it is possible to define \( K \) mutually exclusive sets \( \mathcal{S}_k \), each containing regions of the supports of two classes \( i_k \) and \( j_k \), where \( \bigcup_{c \in C} \text{supp}_c = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{S}_k \), i.e., they cover the whole space of the support of classes;

2. for each \( \mathcal{S}_k \), it is possible to define a bijection between the respective regions of support of classes \( i_k \) and \( j_k \) such that, given all bijection pairs \((x_{i_k}, x_{j_k})\), \( x_{i_k} \in \text{supp}_{i_k} \) and \( x_{j_k} \in \text{supp}_{j_k} \),

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & \quad P(x_{i_k}) = P(x_{j_k}), \\
(b) & \quad \text{a decision model } m \text{ is locally linear around } x_{i_k} \text{ and } x_{j_k}; \\
(c) & \quad \{c^*(x_{i_k}), m(x_{i_k})\} = \{i_k, j_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{c^*(x_{j_k}), m(x_{j_k})\} = \{i_k, j_k\};
\end{align*}
\]

then the expected robustness of \( m \), \( \rho_m \), is related to the expected alignment \( \bar{\pi} \) between \( \nabla_\ell(x) \) and \( \Delta x \) of pairs \((x_{i_k}, x_{j_k})\) over all \( \mathcal{S}_k \), according to

\[
\rho_m \geq \frac{\inf(\mathcal{D}) \times \bar{\pi}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\pi} \geq \frac{2 \times \rho_m}{\text{sup}(\mathcal{D})}, \quad (7)
\]

where \( \mathcal{D} \) is the set of distances \( \|x_{i_k} - x_{j_k}\|_2 \) over all pairs \((x_{i_k}, x_{j_k})\) over all \( \mathcal{S}_k \).

Theorem 2 sets bounds for the relationship between the expected robustness of a model and the average alignment between the model’s gradient and vectors connecting inputs of two adjacent classes. The proof for Theorem 2 is given in Section A.2 in the Supplementary Material. The local linearity assumption of Theorem 2 is likely to hold only if the bijection can be established between the closest points of the supports of adjacent classes. Therefore, we define a metric using the concept of vector pointing to the closest point of the support of \( c^*(x) \). This metric is given by

\[
\bar{\sigma}_\Delta = \int P(x) \frac{\langle \Delta x, \nabla_\ell(x) \rangle}{\|\Delta x\|_2 \|\nabla_\ell(x)\|_2} dx,
\]

\[
\Delta x = \arg\inf_r \{\|r\|_2 : x + r \in \text{supp}_j, x \in \text{supp}_y, j \neq y\}. \quad (8)
\]

In practice, \( \bar{c}(x) \) can be calculated using the linear approximation given in (5), and we propose methods for calculating \( \Delta x \) in Section 2.3. Given that assumptions from Theorem 2 are satisfied for pairs of closest points, \( \bar{\sigma}_\Delta \) as defined (8) will be equal to \( \bar{\pi} \) in (7). For the Spheres dataset, it is possible to establish a bijection as required by Theorem 2 using points of opposite classes along the same radial direction. Since the prior probability of both classes is balanced, and the probability distribution in both supports is uniform, \( P(x_0) = P(x_1) \) holds for any pair of points. The assumption \{c*(x_i), m(x_i)\} = \{i, j\} and \{c*(x_j), m(x_j)\} = \{i, j\}, \( i \neq j \), always holds for binary datasets. Thus, except for a possible violation of the local linearity assumption, Theorem 2 holds for the Spheres dataset. Additionally, the distance between closest points is constant, so both bounds can be combined into an equality \( \rho_m = \|\Delta x\|_2 \times 2 \bar{\sigma}_\Delta /2 \). According to Theorem 2, the optimally robust model has \( \rho_m = (0.3 \times 1)/2 = 0.15 \), which is the expected value. However, the assumptions needed for applying Theorem 2 are unlikely to hold exactly for more complex datasets. We perform empirical analysis to evaluate the alignments of such datasets in Section 3.3. Section 3.4 provides an additional qualitative survey of the approximation defined in Lemma 1 for the models tested in Section 3.3.

2.2. Gradient penalty

We propose that steering \( \nabla_\ell(x) \) by adding a penalty \( L_\alpha \) to a supervised classification loss will increase the robustness of a model. This penalty is given by

\[
L_\alpha := -\lambda_\alpha \bar{\sigma}_\Delta, \quad L = L_\alpha + L \quad (9)
\]

where \( \lambda_\alpha \) is a hyperparameter, \( L \) is the total loss to be optimized and \( L \) is the cross-entropy loss function. This penalty is not meant to replace other robust training methods, but to show that increasing alignment increases robustness.

2.3. Estimating \( \Delta x \)

For almost all real-world datasets, \( \Delta x \) is not trivial to find. To generate it, we use generative adversarial training (Goodfellow et al., 2014) to characterize the support of classes.

2.3.1. Direct generation of \( \Delta \hat{x} \)

We train a generator \( G \) to directly produce the residuals needed to convert from one class to another. The formulation draws from the VR-GAN method (Lanfredi et al., 2019), modified to work with classification tasks instead of regression tasks. For practical reasons, we use this formulation only on binary datasets. Figure 2 shows the overall formulation for training. Residuals \( \Delta \hat{x} \) are produced according to

\[
\Delta \hat{x} = G(x, -y), \quad \hat{x}' = x + \Delta \hat{x}. \quad (10)
\]

We set up an adversarial loss given by

\[
L_D = \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}(D(x), y)], \quad L_{D\hat{x}'} = \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}(D(\hat{x}'), y)], \quad L_G = \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{L}(D(\hat{x}'), -y)], \quad (11)
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \) is binary cross-entropy, \( L_D \) and \( L_{D\hat{x}'} \) are losses for which a discriminator \( D \) is optimized, while \( L_G \) optimizes a generator \( G \). \( G \) is trained to fool \( D \) (\( L_G \)), whereas
Figure 2. Training diagram for directly generating residual approximations $\hat{x}$. The terms $L_{Dx}$, $L_{Dx'}$, and $L_G$ are classification losses, and $L_{RegG}$ penalizes the length of $\hat{x}$.

Figure 3. Diagram for indirectly generating $\hat{x}$. The dashed line depicts the feedback from loss $L_{proj}$ to iteratively update $z$.

$D$ is trained not to be fooled ($L_{Dx}$). This adversarial setup, combined with a traditional supervised loss ($L_{Dx'}$), should make $D$ accept only $x'$ that are in $supp_y$. The loss $L_{Dx'}$ should have a smaller weight than $L_{Dx}$ so that, if $G$ is generating perfect modifications, $D$ can still learn $supp_y$. Finally, we define the term

$$L_{RegG} = \frac{\|\hat{x}\|_2^2}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where $n$ is the dimensionality of $x$. This penalty is used to enforce that $x'$ is the closest point in the learned support of classes. The final optimization is given by

$$G^* = \arg \min_G (\lambda_G L_G + \lambda_{RegG} L_{RegG}),$$

$$D^* = \arg \min_D (\lambda_{Dx} L_{Dx} + \lambda_{Dx'} L_{Dx'}),$$

where $\lambda_G, \lambda_{RegG}, \lambda_{Dx}, \lambda_{Dx'}$ are hyperparameters.

2.3.2. INDIRECT GENERATION OF $\hat{x}$

We propose an indirect method for estimating $\hat{x}$ as a strategy to scale it to multiclass datasets. This method can be easily adapted to new datasets since it uses, with no modifications, any available established conditional GAN (cGAN) (Mirza & Osindero, 2014) for the datasets of interest. We select a cGAN proposed by Kavalerov et al. (2020), that offers competitive results for the CIFAR-10 dataset (Krizhevsky, 2009). After training a conditional generator $G$, we follow a similar algorithm for projection to the generative adversarial network (GAN) manifold as in the Defense-GAN method (Samangouei et al., 2018), precalculating the projection of all images in a dataset to all possible destination classes. In other words, we iteratively find, for each image $x$, the optimal latent space vector

$$z^*_c = \arg \min_z L_{proj}(x, z, c),$$

where $c$ is one of the classes of the dataset, and $L_{proj}$ is a loss that measures both the distance between input image $x$ and $G(z, c)$, and the likelihood of $z$, given by

$$L_{proj}(x, z, c) = \frac{\|x - G(z, c)\|^2}{n} + \lambda_{Regz} \frac{\|z\|^2}{n}.$$  

The result of the projection, $G(z^*_c, c)$, is an estimation of $x'$ for class $c$. We can then indirectly calculate

$$\hat{x} = G(z^*_c, \tilde{c}(x)) - x.$$  

We use a penalty on the norm of $z$ because a Gaussian prior was used when randomly sampling $z$ during training for the chosen cGAN (Kavalerov et al., 2020). A representation of the algorithm can be found in Figure 3. More details of the optimization process can be found in Section A.3 in the Supplementary Material.

2.4. Adversarial defense and attack

Adversarial training with PGD (Madry et al., 2018) aims to find a robust parameterized classifier $m$ by optimizing

$$\min_m \max_\delta \mathcal{L}(m(x + \delta), y), \|\delta\|_p < \epsilon,$$

where $\delta$ is a residual with a limited norm, $\mathcal{L}$ is a classification loss function, $x$ is an input example, $y$ its associated
3. Experiments

We empirically analyzed if improving the robustness of a model using PGD training increased its alignment $\alpha_{\Delta x}$, and if increasing $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ by using the alignment penalty $L_\alpha$ improved robustness. We compared both training methods against a baseline using plain supervised learning. We also compared the values given by our metric $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ against values given by the metric proposed by Etmann et al. (2019), to which we refer as $\alpha'_{\Delta x}$. We adapted the metric, adding a normalization by $\|x\|_2$ to change the range of values to $[0, 1]$, to allow a comparison with $\alpha_{\Delta x}$. The metric was modified as

$$\alpha_{\Delta x} = \int P(x) \frac{\langle x, \nabla \logit(x)_{m(x)} \rangle}{\|x\|_2 \|\nabla \logit(x)_{m(x)}\|_2} dx. \quad (18)$$

All experiments were performed five times. We report the average resulting values and their standard deviations. Section A.1 of the Supplementary Material presents details about the experimental setup.

3.1. Datasets

We performed evaluations on six datasets, two of which were synthetic datasets for which we could define the correct $\Delta x$. For the Spheres dataset, defined in Section 2.1, samples were always drawn randomly at runtime from a standard Gaussian distribution and normalized to the radius of the respective class. The correct $\Delta x$ was calculated by

$$\Delta x = \begin{cases} 0.3 \, x, & \text{if } \|x\| = 1 \\ -0.3 \frac{x}{\|x\|}, & \text{if } \|x\| = 1.3 \end{cases}. \quad (19)$$

We created another synthetic dataset, to which we refer as Squares, composed of images with $224 \times 224$ pixels of centered squares with sides of 142 or 88 pixels. To make the images unique, spatially smoothed Gaussian noise was randomly sampled for each image and added to it. The direction of alignment $\Delta x$ for this dataset was calculated using the subtraction of noiseless images from each class.

To evaluate with more complex datasets, we used the MNIST dataset (Lecun et al., 1998), containing handwritten digits, the CIFAR-10 dataset (Krizhevsky, 2009), containing low-resolution natural images, and a binary chest x-ray (CXR) dataset (Schroeder et al., 2020), to which we refer as COPD. For the MNIST and CIFAR-10 datasets, a fixed set of 10% of the training set was used for validation. To enable the comparison of the method in a multiclass setting with a corresponding binary setting, we also tested the method with a binary MNIST dataset selecting only two similar digits, 3 and 5, to which we refer as MNIST-3/5. The COPD dataset contained posterior-anterior (PA) CXRs labeled for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) using pulmonary function tests (PFTs) (Johnson & Theurer, 2014) and was adopted under an approved Institutional Review Board (IRB)\(^\text{3}\). The intensity range of all image datasets was adjusted to $[-1, 1]$. For COPD and MNIST-3/5, the method presented in Section 2.3.1 was used to estimate $\Delta x$, while for MNIST and CIFAR-10, the method presented in Section 2.3.2 was used. More details about the datasets are given in the Supplementary Material, and example images can be seen in Figure 4 and Figure 5.

3.2. Validating the estimation of $\Delta x$

To validate the direct method for estimating $\Delta x$, we applied it to both datasets for which we know the correct $\Delta x$ and measured the alignment between $\Delta x$ and $\hat{\Delta x}$. We found that, for the Spheres dataset, $\text{sim}(\Delta x, \hat{\Delta x}) = 0.874 \pm 0.019$, and, for the Squares dataset, $\text{sim}(\Delta x, \hat{\Delta x}) = 0.893 \pm 0.058$, demonstrating close alignment. Table 1 shows examples of results for the Spheres dataset. Figure 4 shows examples of generated $\hat{\Delta x}$. The generated $\hat{\Delta x}$ were similar to the expected $\Delta x$ for the Spheres and the Squares datasets. For the COPD dataset, $\Delta x$ had small norms, with changes mainly around the diaphragms and the upper lungs.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Examples of measures for generated $\hat{\Delta x}$ for the Spheres datasets, for two random samples.}
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\hline
\text{Class} & $\|x\|_2$ & $\|\hat{\Delta x}\|_2$ & $\|\hat{x}\|_2$ & $\|x\|_2$ & $\text{sim}(\Delta x, \hat{x})$ \\
\hline
-1 & 1.0 & .307 & 1.27 & 1.3 & .858 \\
1 & 1.3 & .360 & 0.99 & 1.0 & .898 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Diaphragm shape and position are used as COPD evidence in CXR (Foster Jr et al., 1993). The small norms are likely due to the continuous characteristic of disease severity, which leads to the support of both classes being on the same manifold. Furthermore, most samples had PFT values near the threshold between classes.

For the indirect method for estimating $\Delta x$, the chosen cGAN algorithm produced visually good results for the MNIST dataset without any changes to the hyperparameters used for CIFAR-10. We did not apply the method to the Spheres dataset because of incompatibilities with the chosen cGAN. To quantitatively validate the indirect

\(^{2}\) Code is available at https://github.com/ricbl/gradient-direction-of-robust-models

\(^{3}\) IRB_00104019, PI: Schroeder MD
method, we applied it to a version of the Squares dataset adapted to the capabilities of the chosen cGAN, Squares32, for which images had size $32 \times 32$, finding an alignment of $\text{sim}(\Delta x, \hat{\Delta} x) = 0.661 \pm 0.070$. This alignment is good but smaller than the alignments found with the direct method. Visually, we found a worse representation of the variability in the background of images for this method when compared to the method proposed in Section 2.3.1, which only needs to generate the differences between classes, adopting the background from the original image. Examples of generated images can be seen in Figure 5 and Section A.4 of the Supplementary Material. A comparison between the generated images for MNIST-3/5 and MNIST showed that the indirect method generates sharper and slightly more distant images. For the CIFAR-10 dataset, generated images resembled the destination class in most cases but failed more often with some destination classes, such as airplanes, and with images containing certain types of scenes, such as white backgrounds. The generated images for MNIST almost always resembled the destination class.

3.3. Alignment and robustness

For the robustness metric, we report the estimated point $\epsilon_{50\%}$, where 50% of test examples are incorrectly classified after applying PGD attack with varying values of $\epsilon$. We report a single value instead of the usual curve of accuracy as a function of $\epsilon$ to have a more objective evaluation. We used accuracy as the basis of the metric to be comparable to the style of reporting in the literature. The defined $\epsilon_{50\%}$ is equivalent to considering misclassified inputs to have $\rho(x) = 0$ and calculating the median of the estimated robustness, which has been used to evaluate the baseline metric $\pi_x$ (Etmann et al., 2019). In addition to using PGD with $p = \infty$, we calculated the robustness of the models against $L^2$-constrained PGD attacks, with an adapted step $\eta_{L^2} = \eta_L \times \sqrt{n}$, where $n$ is the dimensionality of the data, and against the Square Attack (Andriushchenko et al., 2020), an iterative black-box attack. Since the Square Attack is formulated for images, we adapt it to the Spheres dataset by reshaping its 500-feature vectors to a $20 \times 25$ image. We used the black-box attack to evaluate if any defenses were causing gradient obfuscation (Athalye et al., 2018). For the MNIST, MNIST-3/5, CIFAR-10, and the COPD datasets,
training with alignment penalty as defined in (9) employed a distinct $G$ for each run, and, for calculating the reported $\alpha_{\Delta x}$, a different $G$ than the one used for training. We used the correct $\Delta x$ to calculate $L_\alpha$ and $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ for the Spheres and Squares datasets. Table 2 presents results for robustness and alignment. Graphs of accuracy as a function of $\epsilon$ are given in Section A.7 in the Supplementary Material.

The alignment $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ increased for all PGD-trained models (rows P) when compared to the baseline (rows B). Similarly, the robustness of all models trained with the $L_\alpha$ penalty increased when compared to the baseline (rows B). These results show that alignment $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ and robustness are closely related, and one is a consequence of the other. Theoretically, for the Spheres dataset, $p_x/\alpha_{\Delta x} = 0.15$ when $p = 2$. This value is very close to the ratios of corresponding values in Table 2, which lie between 0.148 and 0.151.

In Table 2, models trained using PGD exhibited the strongest signs of gradient obfuscation, highlighted by the black-box attack (column $\epsilon_{50\%}$, BIBox$_{p=\infty}$) being considerably more potent than the PGD attack (column $\epsilon_{50\%}$, PGD$_{p=\infty}$) for some datasets. Section A.7 in the Supplementary Material provides an analysis of gradient obfuscation using the graphs of accuracy as a function of perturbation norm.

Except for the Spheres dataset, where our proposed alignment metrics $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ mathematically reduces to the alignment metric $\alpha_x$ (Etemann et al., 2019), our metric $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ was larger than $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ in all cases, demonstrating that robust models are more closely aligned with $\Delta x$ than with $x$. It is also worth noting that $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ employs the direction to which the gradient is pointing, providing more information than the $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ metric, which has an absolute value in its numerator. Furthermore, in addition to a different alignment direction ($\Delta x$), our proposed metric proposes a different definition of what is aligning to that direction, $\nabla \logit (x)_{m(x)}$. In contrast, $\nabla \logit (x)$ against $\nabla \logit (x)_{m(x)}$ for the baseline metric $\alpha_{\Delta x}$. The metric we reported corresponds to the highest alignment for the baseline metric considering several possible methods for calculating the input gradient, as shown in Section A.5 in the Supplementary Material.

For most of the datasets, even though the penalty alignment training (rows $L_\alpha$) had the closest alignment (columns $\alpha_{\Delta x}$ and $\alpha_{\Delta x}$), PGD (rows P) had the highest robustness when $p = \infty$ (column $\epsilon_{50\%}$, PGD$_{p=\infty}$). PGD likely not only aligns the gradient but also improves robustness in other ways, such as possibly providing a denser sampling of inputs, especially in critical regions, and making the model more locally linear (Qin et al., 2019). When setting the training method to PGD-training, with varying values of $\epsilon$, both metrics showed a good Pearson correlation with robustness, as seen in Table 3. Our metric showed a better correlation for most datasets. Graphs of the data used to calculate these correlations are provided in Section A.6 of the Supplementary Material.

Table 2. Results for robustness, alignments, and accuracy after training using a plain supervised training baseline (B), alignment penalty ($L_\alpha$), and adversarial training with PGD (P) for 6 datasets: Spheres (S), Squares (Q), MNIST-3/5 ($\mu$), COPD (X), MNIST (M), CIFAR-10 (C). Attacks employed to calculate robustness include PGD (Madry et al., 2018), with two types of norms, and the black-box Square Attack (Andriushchenko et al., 2020) (BIBox).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETUP</th>
<th>ACCURACY (%)</th>
<th>$\epsilon_{5%}$ PGD$_{p=\infty}$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_{5%}$ PGD$_{p=2}$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_{5%}$ BIBox$_{p=\infty}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{\Delta x}$ (OURS)</th>
<th>$\alpha_{\Delta x}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-B</td>
<td>99.4±0.8</td>
<td>0.005±0.001</td>
<td>0.099±0.009</td>
<td>0.0063±0.0004</td>
<td>.659±.028</td>
<td>.659±0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-L$_\alpha$</td>
<td>100.0±0.0</td>
<td>0.0076±0.002</td>
<td>0.133±0.001</td>
<td>0.0083±0.0003</td>
<td>.886±.002</td>
<td>.886±0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>100.0±0.0</td>
<td>0.0073±0.001</td>
<td>0.126±0.002</td>
<td>0.0080±0.0001</td>
<td>.851±.001</td>
<td>.851±0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-B</td>
<td>100.0±0.0</td>
<td>0.031±0.008</td>
<td>16.5±1.6</td>
<td>0.170±.041</td>
<td>.026±.007</td>
<td>.022±.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-L$_\alpha$</td>
<td>100.0±0.0</td>
<td>0.435±0.061</td>
<td>61.9±5.4</td>
<td>0.405±.001</td>
<td>.926±.004</td>
<td>.357±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-P</td>
<td>100.0±0.0</td>
<td>0.501±0.030</td>
<td>61.3±2.0</td>
<td>0.337±.011</td>
<td>.222±.042</td>
<td>.151±0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$-B</td>
<td>99.3±0.4</td>
<td>0.198±0.012</td>
<td>23.6±11</td>
<td>0.232±.010</td>
<td>.171±.029</td>
<td>.013±0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$-L$_\alpha$</td>
<td>99.5±0.5</td>
<td>0.357±0.111</td>
<td>3.88±0.08</td>
<td>0.351±.009</td>
<td>.678±.078</td>
<td>.196±0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$-P</td>
<td>99.5±0.2</td>
<td>0.547±0.007</td>
<td>4.20±15</td>
<td>0.495±.005</td>
<td>.345±.018</td>
<td>.040±0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-B</td>
<td>66.3±1.5</td>
<td>0.006±0.021</td>
<td>0.73±33</td>
<td>0.021±.063</td>
<td>.016±.005</td>
<td>.002±0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-L$_\alpha$</td>
<td>64.2±5.4</td>
<td>0.020±0.047</td>
<td>2.91±6.5</td>
<td>0.028±.007</td>
<td>.163±.009</td>
<td>.064±0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-P</td>
<td>64.7±2.7</td>
<td>0.063±0.029</td>
<td>4.97±2.4</td>
<td>0.072±.032</td>
<td>.081±.007</td>
<td>.023±0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-B</td>
<td>99.2±0.2</td>
<td>0.171±0.004</td>
<td>2.19±.06</td>
<td>0.188±.003</td>
<td>.075±.006</td>
<td>.038±0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-L$_\alpha$</td>
<td>99.2±0.1</td>
<td>0.325±0.009</td>
<td>3.55±.06</td>
<td>0.308±.007</td>
<td>.592±.009</td>
<td>.320±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-P</td>
<td>99.4±0.0</td>
<td>0.554±0.007</td>
<td>4.32±.07</td>
<td>0.489±.001</td>
<td>.181±.012</td>
<td>.043±0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-B</td>
<td>84.0±0.2</td>
<td>0.008±0.0003</td>
<td>0.23±.121</td>
<td>0.008±.005</td>
<td>.008±.003</td>
<td>.008±0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-L$_\alpha$</td>
<td>81.1±0.6</td>
<td>0.012±0.0006</td>
<td>0.44±.023</td>
<td>0.016±.001</td>
<td>.025±.002</td>
<td>.020±0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-P</td>
<td>82.6±0.1</td>
<td>0.023±0.0001</td>
<td>0.77±.003</td>
<td>0.028±.000</td>
<td>.041±.001</td>
<td>.031±0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Pearson correlation between alignment metrics and robustness against PGD attack ($\epsilon_{50\%}$, PGD$_{p=\infty}$) for our proposed metric and the baseline metric $\alpha_x$ (Etmani et al., 2019), with PGD-training as a constant training method. For each dataset, five models were trained for each of 6 or 7 values of $\epsilon$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATASET</th>
<th>$\sigma_{\Delta x}$ (OURS)</th>
<th>$\sigma_{\alpha x}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spheres</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squares</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST-3/5</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPD</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing results between MNIST and MNIST-3/5, robustness was similar for the $L_\alpha$ training method, but $\sigma_{\Delta x}$ was lower for PGD-training for MNIST. The $\sigma_{\Delta x}$ achieved for the CIFAR-10 dataset showed that the alignment with $\Delta x$ is sometimes easier to learn with PGD than with $L_\alpha$.

3.4. Validity of local linearity assumption

Figure 7 qualitatively surveys the validity of the equations from Lemma 1 as an approximation of a model’s robustness. For a minority of the datasets and methods, the approximated robustness is very similar to the robustness. The fact that the approximation from Lemma 1 does not hold perfectly may be one of the reasons for an imperfect correlation between alignment and robustness.

3.5. Qualitative analysis of the changes to the input gradient

Figure 6 shows $\nabla_{\ell_\alpha}(x)$ for random images in each dataset for all three training methods. The calculated $\nabla_{\ell_\alpha}(x)$ are noisier for the baseline and smoother for models trained with $L_\alpha$, whereas PGD-trained models have an intermediate amount of noise and are more localized. Part of the differences in the $\nabla_{\ell_\alpha}(x)$ produced for the MNIST dataset for the $L_\alpha$ and PGD methods is caused by the different $\tilde{c}(x)$ in each case. For this specific sample $\tilde{c}(x) = 0$ for the model trained with $L_\alpha$ and $\tilde{c}(x) = 4$ for the model trained with PGD.

4. Conclusion

We proposed a novel alignment direction for the gradient of robust models as the vector pointing to the closest example of the support of the closest inaccurate class. We validated the proposed direction theoretically and showed experimentally that alignment increases with PGD training and that robustness increases with alignment enforcement. Trained models also showed a closer alignment with the proposed metric than with another metric definition. The metric was not directly predictive of robustness since models with the strongest alignment were not always the most robust. This finding is possibly a result of the violation of the strong assumptions of the theoretical analysis. It also highlights the possibility of PGD increasing robustness by means other than gradient alignment. When comparing models trained with PGD with varying levels of robustness, the proposed metric correlated better with the robustness than the baseline metric for most datasets. Finally, we expand our fundamental understanding of adversarial defenses, benefiting future analyses of model robustness.
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Figure 7. Robustness against $L^2$ Carlini-Wagner attack (Carlini & Wagner, 2017a) as a function of the approximated robustness given by Lemma 1, for 6 datasets and 3 training methods. Each marker represents one test set example. The dashed diagonal gray line represents the identity function. Models were selected randomly from the 5 trained models for each training setup.
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A. Supplementary Material

A.1. Experimental setup and dataset details

We used PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019), torchvision (Marcel & Rodriguez, 2010), advertorch (Ding et al., 2019), NumPy (Harris et al., 2020), pandas (Wes McKinney, 2010; Reback et al., 2020), h5py (Collette et al., 2019), scikit-image (van der Walt et al., 2014), Matplotlib (Hunter, 2007; Caswell et al., 2020) and TensorBoard (Abadi et al., 2016) to build our experiments. For the Spheres dataset, we used a 2-hidden layer network, with 1000 neurons per layer and ReLU non-linearity, and a last-layer output of a 500-dimensional vector for the generator and a scalar for the classifiers. For all other datasets, we used a ResNet-18 (He et al., 2016) as the classifier, with weights pre-trained for ImageNet loaded from PyTorch’s torchvision library. PGD attacks, for training and validation, used $k = 40$. The Square Attack was used with 5000 queries per attack and 80% as the best epoch was chosen by the highest robustness before validation accuracy is stable.

The computer infrastructure employed included 11 Titan V, 6 Titan RTX, and 8 Titan V100 SMX2, and all GPUs were used interchangeably depending on availability. Some of the experiments required large GPU memory capacity, which was available only on Titan RTX. Training, combined with best epoch validation, took between 5 minutes and 62 hours for each run, depending on the dataset, method, and GPU used. The average time for each method and dataset are reported in Table S1. Test evaluations for PGD attack took less than 1 hour each. Table S1 also presents further quantitative detail about the datasets used.

The COPD dataset was filtered to include only samples for which the PFT was acquired within 30 days of the CXR. Patients with an FEV1/FVC lower than 0.7 (Johnson & Theurer, 2014) were assigned to class 1 as having COPD. Images were center-cropped, resized to 256×256, cropped to 224×224 (randomly in training), and had their histograms equalized and range adjusted to [−1,1]. The dataset was split into training, validation, and test sets by patient ID, since some patients were associated with more than one sample.

A.2. Proofs

**Theorem 1.** Let $\text{sim}(u, v)$ be the alignment between vectors $u$ and $v$, defined by their cosine similarity $\text{sim}(u, v) = \frac{u \cdot v}{\|u\|_2 \|v\|_2}$. Let $m$ be a classification model and let $c^*(x) := \arg\min_{c \neq m(x)} \{\|v\|_2 : m(x + v) = c\}$. For a pair of input examples $x_i$ and $x_j$, of different classes $i$ and $j$, respectively, around which $m$ is locally linear and for which $1$ $c^*(x_i), m(x_i) = \{i, j\}$ and $c^*(x_j), m(x_j) = \{i, j\}$, the combined robustness $\rho(x_i) + \rho(x_j)$ of $m$ is directly proportional to $\alpha$ according to $\rho(x_i) + \rho(x_j) = \|x_j - x_i\|_2 \times \alpha$, where $\alpha = \text{sim}(x_j - x_i, \nabla\text{logit}(x_i)) \nabla\text{logit}(x_i).$

**Proof.** Since we assume local linearity, the model can be represented by $\text{logit}(x) = W^T x + b$ by using Lemma 1. Since $\{c^*(x_i), m(x_i)\} = \{i, j\}$ and $\{c^*(x_j), m(x_j)\} = \{i, j\}$, the only two classes involved in the calculation of robustness for both $x_i$ and $x_j$ are $i$ and $j$, i.e. the robustness is always measured between input example and decision boundary separating $i$ and $j$. We can then represent $\text{logit}(x) = W^T x + b$ as a binary model to cal-

\[1\text{The notation of these two equations uses sets, where } \{a, b\} = \{i, j\} \text{ means that either } a = i \text{ and } b = j, \text{ or } a = j \text{ and } b = i.\]
quantifying the preferential direction of the model gradient in adversarial training with projected gradient descent

Table S1. Details about datasets and training setup. ART stands for average running time (in hours), and ℏ for percentage of samples from class -1. The reported ART might be longer than usual runs, since sometimes more than one script was run in the same GPU at the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Spheres</th>
<th>Squares</th>
<th>MNIST-3/5</th>
<th>COPD</th>
<th>MNIST</th>
<th>CIFAR-10</th>
<th>Squares 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train set size</td>
<td>10,000,000/EPOCH</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,397</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation set size</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test set size</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data dimensionality</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>224×224</td>
<td>28×28</td>
<td>224×224</td>
<td>28×28</td>
<td>32×32</td>
<td>32×32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%−1 training set</td>
<td>~50%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%−1 validation set</td>
<td>~50%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%−1 test set</td>
<td>~50%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD - ℏ for training</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># epochs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λα</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λRegz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch size</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART baseline</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART GAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART Lα</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART PGD</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART SQUARE attack</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

calculate robustness, given by logit(ξ) = ⟨w, x⟩ + b = logit(ξ)xj logit(x)i, and where positive outputs are equivalent to outputting class i. The alignment can be simplified as

\[
α = \text{sim}(x_j - x_i, \nabla \text{logit}(x_j) - \nabla \text{logit}(x_i)) = \text{sim}(x_j - x_i, w) = \frac{(x_j, w) - (x_0, 0)}{\|x_j - x_i\|_2 \|w\|_2}, \tag{20}
\]

If x is correctly classified, ρ(x) is equal to the distance between x and the decision boundary. In the case of misclassification, we use the negative of the distance. We can use the equation of signed distance between x and the hyperplane defined by ⟨w, x⟩ + b = 0 and the result from (20) to get

\[
ρ(x_i) = -\frac{(x_i, w) + b}{\|w\|_2}, \quad ρ(x_j) = \frac{(x_j, w) + b}{\|w\|_2}, \quad \tag{21}
\]

\[
ρ(x_i) + ρ(x_j) = \frac{(x_j, w) - (x_i, w)}{\|w\|_2} = \alpha \times \|x_j - x_i\|_2. \tag{22}
\]

Theorem 2. Assuming that, for a multi-class dataset of classes C, i_k and j_k, where \( \bigcup_{c \in C} \text{supp}_c = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{S}_k \), i.e., they cover the whole space of the support of classes:

2. for each \( \mathcal{S}_k \), it is possible to define a bijection between the respective regions of support of classes i_k and j_k such that, given all bijection pairs \( (x_{i_k}, x_{j_k}) \), \( x_{i_k} \in \text{supp}_{i_k} \) and \( x_{j_k} \in \text{supp}_{j_k} \),

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & \; P(x_{i_k}) = P(x_{j_k}), \\
(b) & \; \text{a decision model } m \text{ is locally linear around } x_{i_k} \text{ and } x_{j_k} ; \\
(c) & \; \{c^*(x_{i_k}), m(x_{i_k})\} = \{i_k, j_k\} \quad \text{ and } \quad \{c^*(x_{j_k}), m(x_{j_k})\} = \{i_k, j_k\} ;
\end{align*}
\]

then the expected robustness of \( m \), \( ρ_m \), is related to the expected alignment \( π \) between \( \nabla_ℓ(x) \) and \( Δx \) of pairs \( (x_{i_k}, x_{j_k}) \) over all \( \mathcal{S}_k \), according to

\[
ρ_m \geq \frac{\inf(\mathcal{D}) \times \pi}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi \geq 2 \times \frac{\rho_m}{\sup(\mathcal{D})}, \tag{7}
\]

where \( \mathcal{D} \) is the set of distances \( \|x_{i_k} - x_{j_k}\|_2 \) over all pairs \( (x_{i_k}, x_{j_k}) \) over all \( \mathcal{S}_k \).

Proof. The expected robustness of a model \( m \) can be written as

\[
ρ_m = \frac{C}{\text{supp}_c} \int_{\text{supp}_c} P(x)ρ(x) dx = \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\mathcal{S}_k} P(x)ρ(x) dx. \tag{23}
\]
Since we can establish a bijection in each $\mathcal{S}_k$ between $\text{supp}_{ik}$ and $\text{supp}_{jk}$, we can integrate over both supports at the same time, pair by pair of $x_{ik}$ and $x_{jk}$. Since $P(x_{ik}) = P(x_{jk})$, we can factor the probability, resulting in

$$\rho_m = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \int_{\text{supp}_{ik}, \text{supp}_{jk}} P(x_{ik})(\rho(x_{ik}) + \rho(x_{jk})) \, dx.$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

It is worth noting that sampling is balanced between the two classes in $\mathcal{S}_k$ since, from the established bijection,

$$\int_{\text{supp}_{ik}} P(x) \, dx = \int_{\text{supp}_{jk}} P(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_k} P(x) \, dx. \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

Using Theorem 1 to substitute for $\rho(x_{ik}) + \rho(x_{jk})$ and using (25),

$$\rho_m = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \int_{\text{supp}_{ik}, \text{supp}_{jk}} P(x_{ik})x_i \|x_{ik} - x_{jk}\|_2 \, dx \geq \sum_{k=1}^{K} \inf(\mathcal{Q}) \int_{\text{supp}_{ik}} P(x_{ik})x_i \, dx = \frac{\inf(\mathcal{Q})}{2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_k} P(x) \alpha \, dx = \frac{\inf(\mathcal{Q}) \times \alpha}{2}, \hspace{1cm} (26)$$

$$\rho_m = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \int_{\text{supp}_{ik}, \text{supp}_{jk}} P(x_{ik})x_i \|x_{ik} - x_{jk}\|_2 \, dx \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sup(\mathcal{Q}) \int_{\text{supp}_{ik}} P(x_{ik})x_i \, dx = \frac{\sup(\mathcal{Q})}{2} \int_{\mathcal{S}_k} P(x) \alpha \, dx = \frac{\sup(\mathcal{Q}) \times \alpha}{2}, \alpha \geq 2 \times \rho_m \sup(\mathcal{Q}). \hspace{1cm} (27)$$

\vspace{0.5cm}

\textbf{A.3. Details of the indirect generation of } $\tilde{x}$

The code for the cGAN used in the experiments was cloned from https://github.com/ilyakava/BigGAN-PyTorch. We only added support for loading the MNIST and Square32 dataset and removed the fixed random seed.

Considering the optimization to find $z_c^*$, the hyperparameters were selected from a visual check of the proximity of the images to their original class and the representation of the destination class. During its optimization, $z$ was initialized to the zero vector. The first 600 iterations were calculated with $\lambda_{Regz} = 0$ to facilitate the optimization process. The following 150 iterations were calculated with $\lambda_{Regz} \neq 0$.

This two-step optimization process allowed for using a single optimization per pair $(x_k, \epsilon)$, instead of several random initializations for $z$ to avoid local minima. Optimization over $z$ was performed using the Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015), with learning rate 0.1 for CIFAR-10 and 0.2 for MNIST and Square32.

\vspace{0.5cm}

\textbf{A.4. Additional images generated for gradient estimation}

Figure S1, Figure S2, Figure S3, Figure S4, Figure S5, and Figure S6 show a set of examples for the results of the methods proposed in Section 2.3.

\vspace{0.5cm}

\textbf{A.5. Comparison of baseline alignment metric with several input gradients}

Table S2 shows that the provided baseline metric corresponds to the highest alignment value when comparing several methods of calculating the input gradient.

\vspace{0.5cm}

\textbf{A.6. Correlation between alignment and robustness for a fixed training method}

Figure A.6 shows alignments for a fixed training method (PGD) and varying robustness, controlled by $\epsilon$.

\vspace{0.5cm}

\textbf{A.7. Robustness graphs}

In Figure S8, all attacks with a large enough bound were able to get 100% success, and increasing the perturbation norm $\epsilon$ increased attack success rate, signs that gradient does not suffer from intensive gradient obfuscation (Athalye et al., 2018) in any of the methods. For the Squares dataset, the alignment penalty training method showed some gradient obfuscation for one of the classes, as seen in the bottom gap between black-box attack and PGD attack in Figure S8, without largely reflecting on the numbers of Table 2.
Figure S1. Examples of generated $\hat{x}'$ for the Squares dataset through the direct method. The top row contains the original image $x$, and the bottom row contains the generated $\hat{x}'$. There are five columns per class of $x$.

Figure S2. Examples of generated $\hat{x}'$ for the Squares32 dataset through the indirect method. The top row contains the original image $x$, and the bottom row contains the generated $\hat{x}'$. There are five columns per class of $x$.

Figure S3. Examples of generated $\hat{x}'$ for the MNIST-3/5 dataset through the direct method. The top row contains the original image $x$, and the bottom row contains the generated $\hat{x}'$. There are five columns per class of $x$.

Figure S4. Examples of generated $\hat{x}'$ for the COPD dataset through the direct method. The top row contains the original image $x$, and the bottom row contains the generated $\Delta x$. There are five grouped columns per class of $x$, from left to right: class -1, class 1. We show $\Delta x$ because changes are small and difficult to perceive in $\hat{x}'$. 
Figure S5. Examples of generated $\hat{z}'$ for the MNIST dataset through the indirect method. There are two rows per class of $x$ (left column), and 10 columns on the right of $x$ to represent each of the 10 destination classes.
Figure S6. Examples of generated $\hat{x}'$ for the CIFAR-10 dataset through the indirect method. There are two rows per class of $x$ (left column), and 10 columns on the right of $x$ to represent each of the 10 destination classes. Classes are, from top to bottom and left to right: airplane, car, bird, cat, deer, dog, frog, horse, boat, truck.
Figure S7. Alignment vs. $L_\infty$ robustness for PGD-trained models. Star-like symbols represent our proposed alignment, and asterisk-like symbols represent baseline alignments. For each dataset, the higher the number of spikes/points in a symbol, the higher the value of $\epsilon$ used for PGD-training. There are five models for each $\epsilon$. The line connects the average coordinates of each group of 5 models with fixed $\epsilon$, ordered by $\epsilon$. 
Figure S8. Accuracy of models as a function of perturbation norm $\epsilon$ after training using a plain supervised training baseline (B), alignment penalty ($L_\alpha$), and adversarial training with PGD (P) for 6 datasets: Spheres (S), Squares (Q), MNIST-3/5 ($\mu$), COPD (X), MNIST (M), CIFAR-10 (C). We report results for 3 attacks: PGD (Madry et al., 2018) restricted by the $L^\infty$ norm, the black-box Square Attack (Andriushchenko et al., 2020) (BBox) restricted by the $L^\alpha$ norm, and PGD (Madry et al., 2018) restricted by the $L^2$ norm. Models were selected randomly from the 5 trained models for each training setup.