

Certified Robustness to Text Adversarial Attacks by Randomized [MASK]

Jiehang Zeng, Xiaoqing Zheng*, Jianhan Xu,
Linyang Li, Liping Yuan, Xuanjing Huang

School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China
{jhzeng18, zhengxq, jianhanxu20}@fudan.edu.cn
{linyangli19, lpyuan19, xjhuang}@fudan.edu.cn

Abstract

Recently, few certified defense methods have been developed to provably guarantee the robustness of a text classifier to adversarial synonym substitutions. However, all existing certified defense methods assume that the defenders are informed of how the adversaries generate synonyms, which is not a realistic scenario. In this paper, we propose a certifiably robust defense method by randomly masking a certain proportion of the words in an input text, in which the above unrealistic assumption is no longer necessary. The proposed method can defend against not only word substitution-based attacks, but also character-level perturbations. We can certify the classifications of over 50% texts to be robust to any perturbation of 5 words on AGNEWS, and 2 words on SST2 dataset. The experimental results show that our randomized smoothing method significantly outperforms recently proposed defense methods across multiple datasets.¹

1 Introduction

Although deep neural networks have achieved prominent performance on many NLP tasks, they are vulnerable to adversarial examples that are intentionally crafted by replacing, scrambling, and erasing characters (Gao et al., 2018; Ebrahimi et al., 2018) or words (Alzantot et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2019a; Zheng et al., 2020; Jin et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020) under certain semantic and syntactic constraints. These adversarial examples are imperceptible to humans but can easily fool deep neural networks. The existence of adversarial examples has raised serious concerns, especially when deploying such NLP models to security-sensitive tasks.

Many methods have been proposed to defend against adversarial attacks for neural NLP models.

*Corresponding author

¹The source code is available at <https://github.com/zjiehang/RanMASK>.

Most of them are evaluated empirically, including adversarial data augmentation (Jin et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020), adversarial training (Madry et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2020), Dirichlet Neighborhood Ensemble (DNE) (Zhou et al., 2020) and so on. Although the above-mentioned methods can empirically defend against the attack algorithms used during the training, the trained model often cannot survive from other stronger attacks. Certified defense methods have recently been proposed (Jia et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2019) by certifying the performance within the convex hull formed by the embeddings of a word and its synonyms. However, due to the difficulty of propagating convex hull through deep neural networks, they compute a loose outer bound using Interval Bound Propagation (IBP). As a result, IBP-based certified defense methods are hard to scale to large architectures such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019).

To achieve certified robustness on large architectures, Ye et al. (2020) proposed SAFER, a randomized smoothing method that can provably ensure that the prediction cannot be altered by any possible synonymous word substitution. However, existing certified defense methods assume that the defenders know how the adversaries generate synonyms, which is not a realistic scenario since we cannot impose a limitation on the synonym table used by the attackers. Actually, existing adversarial attack algorithms for NLP models may use a synonym table in which a single word can have many (up to 50) synonyms (Jin et al., 2020), generate synonyms dynamically by using BERT (Li et al., 2020), or perform character-level perturbations (Gao et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019) to launch attacks.

In this paper, we propose **RanMASK**, a certifiably robust defense method against text adversarial attacks based on a new randomized smoothing technique for NLP models. The proposed method works by repeatedly performing random “mask”




Figure 1: Consider an original sentence given at the top, we assume that an adversarial example is created by replacing the word “grades” with “scores” and “football” with “fo0tba1l”. Taking the adversarial example as input, we randomly mask three words (indicated by [MASK]) on the input and generate a set of masked copies. A base classifier is then used to label each of these masked copies (only five are shown here for clarity), and the prediction scores on the masked texts are ensembled to get a robust output.

operations on an input text, in order to generate a large set of masked copies of the text. A base classifier is then used to classify each of these masked texts, and the final robust classification is made by “majority vote” (see Figure 1). In the training time, the base classifier is also trained with similar masked text samples.

The key idea is that, if a sufficient number of words are randomly masked from a text before the text is given to the base classifier and a relatively small number of words have been intentionally perturbed, then it is highly unlikely that all of the perturbed words (adversarially chosen) are present in a given masked text. Note that remaining just some of these perturbed words is often not enough to fool the base classifier. Given a text x and a potentially adversarial text x' , if we use a statistically sufficient number of random masked samples, and if the observed “gap” between the number of “votes” for the top class and the number of “votes” for any other class at x is sufficiently large, then we can guarantee with high probability that the robust classification at x' will be the same as it is at x . Therefore, we can prove that with high probability, the smoothed classifier will label x robustly against any text adversarial attack which is allowed to perturb a certain number of words in an input text at both word-level and character-level.

The major advantage of our method over existing certified defense methods is that our certified robustness is not based on the assumption that the defenders know how the adversaries generate synonyms. Given a text, the adversaries are allowed to replace few words with their synonyms (word-level perturbation) or deliberately misspell few of them (character-level perturbation). Through extensive experiments on multiple datasets, we show

that RanMASK achieved better performance on adversarial samples than existing defense methods. Experimentally, we can certify the classifications of over 50% sentences to be robust to any perturbation of 5 words on AGNEWS dataset, and 2 words on SST2. Furthermore, unlike most certified defenses (except SAFER), the proposed method is easy to implement and can be integrated into any existing neural network including those with large architecture such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019).

2 Related Work

Many defense methods have been proposed to defend against text adversarial attacks, which can roughly be divided into two categories: *empirical* (Miyato et al., 2017; Sato et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2021) and *certified* (Jia et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2019; Ye et al., 2020) methods.

Adversarial data augmentation is one of the most effective empirical defenses (Ren et al., 2019b; Jin et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020) for NLP models. During the training time, they replace a word with one of its synonyms to create adversarial examples. By augmenting these adversarial examples with the original training data, the model is robust to such perturbations. However, the number of possible perturbations scales exponentially with sentence length, so data augmentation cannot cover all perturbations of an input text. Zhou et al. (2020) and Dong et al. (2021) use a convex hull formed by a word and its synonyms to capture word substitution-based perturbations, and they guarantee with high probability that the model is robust at any point within the convex hull. Adversarial training (Miyato et al., 2017; Zhu et al., 2020) is another one of the most successful empirical defense methods by adding norm-bounded adversarial perturbations

to word embeddings and minimizes the resultant adversarial loss. However, they focus on the effects on generalization rather than the robustness against adversarial attacks.

Although the above empirical methods can experimentally defend the attack algorithms used during the training, the downside of such methods is that failure to discover an adversarial example does not mean that another more sophisticated attack could not find one. Recently, a set of certified defenses has been introduced, which guarantees the robustness to some specific types of attacks. For example, Jia et al. (2019) and Huang et al. (2019) use a bounding technique, Interval Bound Propagation (Gowal et al., 2018; Dvijotham et al., 2018), to formally verify a model’s robustness against word substitution-based perturbations. However, these certified defense methods are usually hard to scale to large networks, such as BERT. Ye et al. (2020) proposed a certified robust method, called SAFER, which is structure-free and can be applied to arbitrary large architectures.

All existing certified defense methods make an unrealistic assumption that the defenders can access the synonyms used by the adversaries. They could be broken by more sophisticated attacks by using synonym sets with large size (Jin et al., 2020), generating synonyms dynamically with BERT (Li et al., 2020), or perturbing the inputs at the character-level (Gao et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019). In this paper, we show that random smoothing can be integrating with random masking strategy to boost the certified robust accuracy. In contrast to existing certified robust methods, the above unrealistic assumption is no longer required. Furthermore, the NLP models trained by our defense method can defend against both the word substitution-based attacks and character-level perturbations.

3 Preliminaries and Notation

For text classification, a neural network-based classifier $f(\mathbf{x})$ maps an input text $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ to a label $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_h$ is a text consisting of h words and \mathcal{Y} is a set of discrete categories.

Given an original input \mathbf{x} , adversarial examples are created to cause a model to make mistakes. The adversaries may create an adversarial example $\mathbf{x}' = x'_1, \dots, x'_h$ by perturbing at most $d \leq h$ words in \mathbf{x} . We say \mathbf{x}' is a good adversarial example of \mathbf{x} for untargeted attack if:

$$f(\mathbf{x}') \neq y, \quad \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d \quad (1)$$

where y is the truth output for \mathbf{x} , and $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{x_i \neq x'_i\}$ is the Hamming distance, with $\mathbb{I}\{\cdot\}$ the indicator function. For character-level perturbations, x'_i is a visually similar misspelling or typo of x_i , and for word-level substitutions, x'_i is any of x_i ’s synonyms, where the synonym sets are chosen by the adversaries, which may not be known by the defenders. A model f is said to be *certified robust* against adversarial attacks on an input \mathbf{x} if it is able to give consistently correct predictions for all the possible adversarial examples \mathbf{x}' under the constraint of $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d$.

Let $\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'$ denote the set of word indices at which \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' differ, so that $|\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'| = \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0$. For example, if $\mathbf{x} = \text{“A B C E D”}$ and $\mathbf{x}' = \text{“A F C G D”}$, $\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}' = \{2, 4\}$ and $|\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'| = 2$. Also, let \mathcal{S} denote the set of indices $\{1, \dots, h\}$, $\mathcal{I}(h, k) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ all sets of k unique indices in \mathcal{S} , where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ is the power set of \mathcal{S} , and $\mathcal{U}(h, k)$ the uniform distribution over $\mathcal{I}(h, k)$. Note that to sample from $\mathcal{U}(h, k)$ is to sample k out of h indices uniformly without replacement. For instance, an element sampled from $\mathcal{U}(5, 3)$ might be $\{1, 3, 5\}$.

We define a *mask* operation $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{I}(h, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{mask}}$, where $\mathcal{X}_{\text{mask}}$ is a set of texts in which some words may be masked. This operation takes an text of length h and a set of indices as inputs and outputs the text, with all words except those in the set replaced with a special token [MASK]. For example, $\mathcal{M}(\text{“A F C G D”}, \{1, 3, 5\}) = \text{“A [MASK] C [MASK] D”}$. Following Devlin et al. (2019), we use [MASK] to replace the words masked.

4 RanMASK: Certified Defense Method

Inspired by the work of (Cohen et al., 2019; Levine and Feizi, 2020) in the image domain, our idea is to replace a base model f with a more smoothed model that is easier to verify by ensembling the outputs of a number of random masked inputs. In particular, let $f : \mathcal{X}_{\text{mask}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a base classifier, which is trained to classify texts with some words masked, and we define a smoothed classifier $g(\mathbf{x})$:

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{c \in \mathcal{Y}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H} \sim \mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})} (f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c) \right] \quad (2)$$

where $h_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the length of \mathbf{x} , and $k_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the number of words retained (not masked) from \mathbf{x} , which is calculated by $\lfloor h_{\mathbf{x}} - \rho \times h_{\mathbf{x}} \rfloor$, where ρ is the percentage of words that are masked. To simplify notation, we let $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ denote the probability that,

after randomly masking, f returns the class c :

$$p_c(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H} \sim \mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})} (f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c). \quad (3)$$

Then, $g(\mathbf{x})$ can be defined as $\arg \max_{c \in \mathcal{Y}} p_c(\mathbf{x})$. In other words, $g(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the class most likely to be returned if we first randomly mask all but $k_{\mathbf{x}}$ words from \mathbf{x} and then classify the resulting text with the base classifier.

4.1 Certified Robustness

We are ready to prove the following theorem, which can be used to develop a robustness certificate.

Theorem 1. *Given text \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' , $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d$, for all class $c \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have:*

$$p_c(\mathbf{x}) - p_c(\mathbf{x}') \leq \beta \Delta \quad (4)$$

where

$$\Delta = 1 - \frac{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}} - d}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}}{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}}, \quad (5)$$

$$\beta = \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c \mid \mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset).$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{H} \sim \mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} p_c(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c), \\ p_c(\mathbf{x}') &= \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})) = c). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

By the law of total probability, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} p_c(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset]) + \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset]) \\ p_c(\mathbf{x}') &= \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset]) + \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset]). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that if $\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset$, then \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' are identical at all indices in \mathcal{H} . In this case, we have $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})$, which implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c \mid \mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset) &= \\ \mathbb{P}(f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})) = c \mid \mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset) & \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Multiplying both sides of (8) by $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset]) &= \\ \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset]) & \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

By (7), (9) and the non-negativity of probability, subtracting $p_c(\mathbf{x}')$ from $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned} p_c(\mathbf{x}) - p_c(\mathbf{x}') &= \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset]) - \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}', \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset]) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset]) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

By the definition of β , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}([f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c] \wedge [\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset]) &= \\ \beta \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset) & \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Substituting (11) into (10) gives:

$$p_c(\mathbf{x}) - p_c(\mathbf{x}') \leq \beta \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset) \quad (12)$$

Note that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset) = \frac{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}} - |\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'|}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}}{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}} = \frac{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}} - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}}{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}} \quad (13)$$

where the last equality follows since \mathcal{H} is a uniform choice of $k_{\mathbf{x}}$ elements from $h_{\mathbf{x}}$: there are $\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}$ total ways to make this selection. Among all these selections, there are $\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}} - |\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'|}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}$ of which do not contain any element from $\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'$.

By the constraint of $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') \neq \emptyset) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H} \cap (\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}') = \emptyset) \\ &= 1 - \frac{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}} - \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}}{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}} \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}} - d}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}}{\binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{k_{\mathbf{x}}}} = \Delta \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Combining inequalities (12) and (14) gives the statement of Theorem 1. \square

It is impossible to exactly compute the probabilities with which f classifies $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})$ as each class. Therefore, it is also impossible to exactly evaluate $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$ at any input \mathbf{x} . Let $\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x})$ denote a lower bound on $p_c(\mathbf{x})$, we can bound $\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x})$ with $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence. Following Cohen et al. (2019) and Jia et al. (2019), we estimate $\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x})$ using the standard one-sided Clopper-Pearson method (Clopper and Pearson, 1934). Specifically, we randomly construct n masked copies of \mathbf{x} , then count for class c as $n_c = \sum_i^n \mathbb{I}(f(\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H})) = c)$ according to the outputs of f (see Algorithm 2 for details). Assuming that n_c follows a binomial distribution with parameters n and p_c , $n_c \sim \mathbf{B}(n, p_c)$, where $p_c = n_c/n$, we have:

$$\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x}) = \text{Beta}(\alpha; n_c, n - n_c + 1), \quad (15)$$

where $\text{Beta}(\alpha; u, v)$ is the α -th quantile of a beta distribution with parameters u and v , and $(1 - \alpha)$ is the confidence level.

Corollary 1.1. *For text \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{x}' , $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d$, if*

$$\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x}) - \beta \Delta > 0.5 \quad (16)$$

then, with probability at least $(1 - \alpha)$:

$$g(\mathbf{x}') = c \quad (17)$$

Proof. With probability at least $(1 - \alpha)$ we have:

$$0.5 < \underline{p_c(\mathbf{x})} - \beta\Delta \leq p_c(\mathbf{x}) - \beta\Delta \leq p_c(\mathbf{x}') \quad (18)$$

Where the last inequality is from Theorem 1. Then $g(\mathbf{x}') = c$ from the definition of g . If $c = y$ (the truth output for \mathbf{x}) and if $\underline{p_c(\mathbf{x})} - \beta\Delta > 0.5$, the smoothed g is *certified robust* at the input \mathbf{x} . \square

4.2 Estimating the Value of β

We discuss how to estimate the value of β defined in Theorem 1 here. Recall that β is the probability that f will label the masked copies of \mathbf{x} with the class c where the indices of unmasked words are overlapped with $\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'$ (i.e., the set of word indices at which \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' differ). We use a Monte Carlo algorithm to evaluating β by sampling a large number of elements from $\mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})$. To simplify notation, we let r denote the value of $|\mathbf{x} \ominus \mathbf{x}'|$.

Algorithm 1 For estimating the value of β

```

1: procedure BETAESTIMATOR( $\mathbf{x}, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, r, f, n_r, n_k$ )
2:    $\beta \leftarrow 0$ 
3:    $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow$  Sampling  $n_r$  elements from  $\mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, r)$ 
4:   for each  $a$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  do
5:      $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow$  Sampling  $n_k$  elements from  $\mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})$ 
6:     for each  $b$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  do
7:       if  $a \cap b = \emptyset$  then
8:          $\mathcal{B}.delete(b)$ 
9:    $p_c \leftarrow$  Using Eq. (3) with  $f$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ .
10:   $\beta \leftarrow \beta + p_c$ 
11:   $\beta \leftarrow \beta/n_r$ 
12:  return  $\beta$ 

```

The Monte Carlo-based algorithm used to evaluate β is given in Algorithm 1. We first sample n_r elements from $\mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, r)$ and each sampled element, denoted by a , is a set of indices where the words are supposed to be perturbed. For every a , we then sample n_k elements from $\mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})$, each of which, denoted by b , is set of indices where the words are not masked. We remove those from n_k elements if the intersection of a and b is empty. With the remaining elements and f , we can approximately compute the value of β .

As the value of r grows, for any a it is more likely that a is overlapped with any sampled b , and the value β will approach to $p_c(\mathbf{x})$. To investigate how close the values of β and $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ are to each other, we conducted an experiment on the test set of AGNEWS, in which $n_r = 200$ and $n_k = 10,000$, and use the Jensen-Shannon divergence to calculate the distance of these two distributions. As we can see from Figure 2, no matter what value of ρ is, all the Jensen-Shannon divergences values are very




Figure 2: The Jensen-Shannon divergence between the values of β and $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ estimated on AGNEWS with different masking rate ρ . No matter what value of ρ is, all the divergence values are less than 2.5×10^{-5} . Therefore, we can use $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ to approximate the value of β .

small and less than 2.5×10^{-5} . Therefore, we can use $p_c(\mathbf{x})$ to approximate the value of β , namely $\beta \approx p_c(\mathbf{x})$, in all the following experiments.

Algorithm 2 For prediction and certification

```

1: procedure CLASSIFIERG( $\mathbf{x}, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, f, n$ )
2:    $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow$  sampling  $n$  elements from  $\mathcal{U}(h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}})$ 
3:    $counts \leftarrow 0$  for each label  $c \in \mathcal{Y}$ 
4:   for each  $\mathcal{H}$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  do
5:      $\mathbf{x}_{mask} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{H}), c \leftarrow f(\mathbf{x}_{mask})$ 
6:      $counts[c] \leftarrow counts[c] + 1$ 
7:   return  $count$ 
8: procedure PREDICT( $\mathbf{x}, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, f, n$ )
9:    $counts \leftarrow$  CLASSIFIERG( $\mathbf{x}, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, f, n$ )
10:   $\hat{c} \leftarrow$  the top index with the maximum  $counts$ 
11:   $p_{\hat{c}} \leftarrow counts[\hat{c}]/n$ 
12:  return  $\hat{c}, p_{\hat{c}}$ 
13: procedure CERTIFY( $\mathbf{x}, y, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, f, n, n', \alpha$ )
14:   $\hat{c}, p_{\hat{c}} \leftarrow$  PREDICT( $\mathbf{x}, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, f, n$ )
15:  if  $\hat{c} \neq y$  then return "N/A"
16:  else
17:     $counts \leftarrow$  CLASSIFIERG( $\mathbf{x}, h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, f, n'$ )
18:     $p_y \leftarrow$  Using Eq. (15) with  $counts[y], n'$  and  $\alpha$ 
19:     $\beta \leftarrow counts[y]/n'$ 
20:    for  $d$  from 0 to  $h_{\mathbf{x}}$  do
21:       $\Delta \leftarrow$  Using Eq. (5) with  $h_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $d$ 
22:      if  $p_y - \beta\Delta > 0.5$  then  $d \leftarrow d + 1$ 
23:      else break
24:    return  $d$ 

```

4.3 Practical Algorithms

In order for g to classify the labeled examples correctly and robustly, the base classifier f is trained to classify texts in which ρ words are masked. Specifically, at each training iteration, we first sample a mini-batch of samples and randomly performing mask operation on the samples. We then apply gradient descent on f based on the masked mini-batch.

We present practical Monte Carlo algorithms for

evaluating $g(\mathbf{x})$ and certifying the robustness of g around \mathbf{x} in Algorithm 2. Evaluating the smoothed classifier’s prediction $g(\mathbf{x})$ requires identify the class c with maximal weight in the categorical distribution. The procedure described in pseudocode as PREDICT randomly draws n masked copies of \mathbf{x} and runs these n copies through f . If c appeared more than any other class, then PREDICT returns c .

Evaluating and certifying the robustness of g around an input \mathbf{x} requires not only identify the class c with maximal weight, but also estimating a lower bound $\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x})$ and β . The procedure described as CERTIFY, we first ensure that g correctly classifies \mathbf{x} as y , and then estimate the values of $\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x})$ and β by randomly generating n' masked copies of \mathbf{x} , where n' is much greater than n . We gradually increase the value of d (the number words can be perturbed) from 0 by 1, and compute Δ by Equation (5). This process will continue until $\underline{p}_c(\mathbf{x}) - \beta\Delta \leq 0.5$ (see Corollary 1.1), and when it stops CERTIFY returns d as the maximum *certified robustness* for \mathbf{x} . In this way, we can certify with $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence that $g(\mathbf{x}')$ will return the label y for any adversarial example \mathbf{x}' if $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d$.

5 Experiments

We first give the certified robustness of our RanMASK on AGNEWS (Zhang et al., 2015) and SST2 (Socher et al., 2013) datasets, and then report the empirical robustness on these datasets by comparing with other representative defense methods, including PGD-K (Madry et al., 2018), FreeLB (Zhu et al., 2020), Adv-Hotflip (Ebrahimi et al., 2018), and adversarial data augmentation. Finally, we empirically compare RanMASK with SAFER (Ye et al., 2020), a recently proposed certified defense that also can be applied to BERT. We found that different randomized smoothing methods may behave quite differently when different ensemble methods are used. We show that the “majority-vote” ensemble sometimes could fool the score-based attack algorithms using the greedy search strategy.

5.1 Implementation Details

BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) was pretrained by using a “masked language model”, and our mask operation is the same as that used in training BERT. Therefore, we use BERT and its variant, RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) as our base models. Unless otherwise specified, all the models are trained with AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019)

with a weight decay $(1e - 6)$ and a learning rate $(5e - 5)$, which is decayed by the cosine annealing method (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017).

We randomly selected 1,000 test examples for each dataset in both certified and empirical experiments. When conducting the experiments of certified robustness, we set the uncertainty α to 0.05, the number of samples n for PREDICT procedure to 1,000, the number of samples n' for CERTIFY to 5,000. To evaluate the empirical robustness of models, we set n to 100 to speed up the process.

5.2 Results of the Certified Robustness

We here provide the certified robustness of RanMASK on AGNEWS and SST2. We refer to the following metrics when reporting certified results:

- The *certified robustness* of a text \mathbf{x} is the maximum d for which we can certify that the smoothed classifier $g(\mathbf{x}')$ will return the *correct* label y where \mathbf{x}' is any adversarial example of \mathbf{x} such that $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_0 \leq d$. If $g(\mathbf{x})$ labels \mathbf{x} incorrectly, we define the certified robustness as “N/A” (see Algorithm 2).
- The *certified rate* of a text \mathbf{x} is the *certified robustness* of \mathbf{x} divided by \mathbf{x} ’s length $h_{\mathbf{x}}$.
- The *median certified robustness* (MCB) on a dataset is the median value of the *certified robustness* across the dataset. It is the maximum d for which the smoothed classifier g can guarantee robustness for at least 50% texts in the dataset. In other words, we can certify the classifications of over 50% texts to be robust to any perturbation of at most d words. When computing this median, the texts which g misclassifies are counted as having $-\infty$ certified robustness. For example, if the certified robustness of the texts in a dataset are $\{\text{N/A}, \text{N/A}, 1, 2, 3\}$, the *median certified robustness* is 1, not 2.
- The *median certified rate* (MCR) on a dataset is the median value of the *certified rate* across the datasets, which is obtained in a similar way to MCB.

We first tested the robust classification on AGNEWS using RoBERTa (Liu et al., 2019) as the base classifier. As we can see from Table 1, the maximum MCB was achieved at 5 when using the masking rate $\rho = 90\%$ or $\rho = 95\%$, indicating that we can certify the classifications of over 50% sentences to be robust to any perturbation of at most

5 words. We chose to use the model ($\rho = 90\%$) to evaluate the empirical robustness on AGNEWS because it gives better classification accuracy.

Rate $\rho\%$	Accuracy%	MCB	MCR%
40	96.2	1	2.6
50	95.7	1	2.7
60	95.7	2	5.0
65	95.0	2	5.0
70	94.5	2	5.0
75	93.9	3	7.0
80	92.0	3	7.5
85	92.2	4	8.8
90	91.1	5	11.4
95	85.8	5	11.8

Table 1: Robustness certificates on AGNEWS with different masking rates ρ . The maximum median certified robustness (MCB) was achieved when using $\rho = 90\%$ or 95% . We use the model (highlighted in bold) when evaluating the empirical robustness against adversarial attacks. ‘‘MCR’’ denotes the median certified rate.

We evaluated the robust classification on SST2 using RoBERTa as the base classifier. As shown in Table 2, the maximum MCB was achieved at 2 when $\rho = 70\%$ or 80% , indicating that over 50% sentences are robust to any perturbation of 2 words. But, these two models achieve the maximum MCB in a higher cost of clean accuracy (about 10% drop compared with the best). We chose to use the model ($\rho = 30\%$) to evaluate the empirical robustness on SST2 due to its higher classification accuracy on the clean data. We found that it is impossible to train the models when $\rho \geq 90\%$. Unlike AGNEWS (created for the news topic classification), SST2 was constructed for the sentiment analysis. The sentiment of a text largely depends on whether few specific sentiment words occur in the text. All the sentiment words in a text would be masked with high probability when a large masking rate is applied, which makes it hard for any model to correctly predict the sentiment of the masked texts.

5.3 Results of the Empirical Robustness

As mentioned in the introduction, if a relatively small proportion of words are perturbed (relative to the masking rate ρ), then it is highly unlikely that all of the perturbed words can survive from the random masking. As the value of ρ decreases, we have to make sure that the following *risk probability* is greater than 0.5 for any text \mathbf{x} ; otherwise more than 50% masked copies of \mathbf{x} will contain all the perturbed words, which easily causes the base classifier f to make mistakes, and so does g .

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}, \rho, \gamma) = \binom{(1-\gamma)h_{\mathbf{x}}}{(1-\gamma-\rho)h_{\mathbf{x}}} / \binom{h_{\mathbf{x}}}{\rho h_{\mathbf{x}}} \quad (19)$$

Rate $\rho\%$	Accuracy%	MCB	MCR%
20	92.4	1	5.26
30	92.4	1	5.26
40	91.2	1	5.26
50	89.3	1	5.56
60	84.3	1	7.41
70	83.3	2	8.00
80	81.4	2	10.00
90	49.6	N/A	N/A

Table 2: Robustness certificates on SST2 with different masking rates ρ . The maximum median certified robustness (MCB) was achieved when $\rho = 70\%$ or 80% . We use the model (highlighted in bold) when evaluating the empirical robustness against adversarial attacks because $\rho = 30\%$ gives the better classification.

where γ is the maximum percentage of words that can be perturbed. For AGNEWS dataset, this risk probability is very close to zero when $\rho = 90\%$ no matter what the value of γ is applied. We use the average length of texts in a dataset (instead of each text) to estimate the risk probability. For SST2, this risk probability is approximately equal to 0.5 when $\rho = 30\%$. To reduce this risk, we designed a new sampling strategy in which the probability of a word being masked corresponds to its output probability of a BERT-based language model (LM). Generally, the higher the output probability of a word is, the lower the probability that this word is perturbed. We would like to retain the words that have not been perturbed as much as possible. This LM-based sampling instead of that based on the uniform distribution was used to evaluate the empirical results on SST2. Note that LM-based sampling is unnecessary when evaluating on AGNEWS.

In the following experiments, we consider two ensemble methods (Cheng et al., 2020): *logits-summed* ensemble (logit) and *majority-vote* ensemble (vote). In the ‘‘logit’’ method, we take the average of the logits produced by the base classifier f over all the individual random samples as the final prediction. In the ‘‘vote’’ strategy, we simply count the votes for each class label. The following metrics are used to report the empirical results:

- The *clean accuracy* (Cln) is the classification accuracy achieved on the clean texts \mathbf{x} .
- The *robust accuracy* (Boa) is the accuracy of a classifier achieved under a certain attack.
- The *success rate* (Succ) is the number of texts successfully perturbed by an attack algorithm (causing the model to make errors) divided by all the number of texts to be attempted.

Method	TextFooler			BERT-Attack			DeepWordBug		
	Cln%	Boa%	Succ%	Cln%	Boa%	Succ%	Cln%	Boa%	Succ%
Baseline (RoBERTa)	93.9	15.8	83.2	94.7	26.7	71.8	94.2	33.0	65.0
PGD-10 (Madry et al., 2018)	95.0	22.3	76.5	95.3	30.0	68.5	94.9	38.8	59.1
FreeLB (Zhu et al., 2020)	93.9	24.6	73.8	95.3	28.3	70.3	93.7	44.0	53.0
Adv-Hotflip (Ebrahimi et al., 2018)	93.4	21.3	77.2	93.9	26.8	71.5	94.6	37.6	60.3
Adversarial Data Augmentation	93.3	23.7	74.6	92.3	39.1	57.6	93.8	49.7	47.0
RanMASK-90% (logit)	89.1	42.7	52.1	88.5	30.0	66.1	89.8	45.4	45.4
RanMASK-90% (vote)	91.2	55.1	39.6	89.1	41.1	53.9	90.3	57.5	36.0

Table 3: Empirical results on AGNEWS. RanMASK-90% with the “vote” ensemble method achieved the best results on the robust accuracy under all three different attack algorithm, indicating that RanMASK can defend against both word substitution-based attacks and character-level perturbations.

Method	TextFooler			BERT-Attack			DeepWordBug		
	Cln%	Boa%	Succ%	Cln%	Boa%	Succ%	Cln%	Boa%	Succ%
Baseline (RoBERTa)	94.3	5.4	94.3	93.9	6.2	93.4	94.7	17.0	82.1
PGD-10 (Madry et al., 2018)	94.0	5.6	94.0	94.4	5.6	94.1	92.9	18.3	80.3
FreeLB (Zhu et al., 2020)	93.7	13.9	85.2	93.8	10.4	89.0	93.0	23.7	74.5
Adv-Hotflip (Ebrahimi et al., 2018)	94.3	12.3	87.0	93.8	11.4	87.9	93.3	23.4	74.9
Adversarial Data Augmentation	91.0	9.6	89.5	88.2	16.9	80.8	91.8	23.5	74.4
RanMASK-30% (vote)	92.7	12.9	86.1	93.0	11.4	87.7	92.7	27.5	70.3
RanMASK-30% (vote) + LM	90.6	23.4	74.2	90.4	22.8	74.8	91.0	41.7	53.1

Table 4: Empirical results on SST2. RanMASK-30% with the “vote” ensemble method and the LM-based sampling strategy achieved the best results on the robust accuracy under all three different attack algorithm.

We evaluate the empirical robustness under test-time attacks by using TextAttack² framework (Morris et al., 2020) with three black-box, score-based attack algorithms: TextFooler (Jin et al., 2020), BERT-Attack (Li et al., 2020), and DeepWordBug (Gao et al., 2018). TextFooler and BERT-Attack adversarially perturb the text inputs by the word-level substitutions, while DeepWordBug performs the character-level perturbations to the inputs.

The results of the empirical robustness on AGNEWS listed shown in Table 3. RanMASK-90% consistently performs better than the competitors under all the three attack algorithms on the robust accuracy while suffering little performance drop on the clean data. The empirical results on SST2 are reported in Table 4, and we found similar trends as those on AGNEWS, especially for those when the LM-based sampling was applied. The results for both datasets show that our RanMASK consistently achieves better robust accuracy while suffering little loss on the original clean data.

5.4 Comparison with SAFER

We report in Table 5 the empirical robustness of RanMASK on AGNEWS compared with SAFER, a very recently proposed certified defense (Ye et al., 2020). From these numbers, we found that RanMASK outperforms SAFER under the setting

Method	TextFooler		DWB	
	Cln%	Boa%	Cln%	Boa%
Baseline (BERT)	93.0	5.6	94.3	16.6
SAFER (logit)	94.6	26.1	95.1	31.9
RanMASK-5% (logit)	94.4	13.2	94.8	23.4
RanMASK-90% (logit)	91.3	47.3	89.2	39.6
SAFER (vote)	95.4	78.6	95.2	78.4
RanMASK-5% (vote)	93.9	68.6	95.3	77.1
RanMASK-5% (vote) + LM	94.8	71.4	93.8	80.3
RanMASK-90% (vote)	90.3	51.9	90.4	51.8

Table 5: Empirical results of RanMASK on AGNEWS compared with SAFER under two attack algorithms: TextFooler and DeepWordBug (denoted as “DWB”).

where the “logit” ensemble is used, while SAFER slightly performs better than RanMASK when using the “vote” ensemble for the predictions under the attack of TextFooler. However, this comparison is not direct and fair. First, SAFER makes use of the same synonym table used by TextFooler. Second, we found that different smoothing defense methods behave quite differently as the ensemble method is changed from the “vote” to the “logit.”

Typical score-based attack algorithms, such as TextFooler and DeepWordBug, usually use two steps to craft adversarial examples: greedily identify the most vulnerable position to change; modify it slightly to maximize the model’s prediction error. This two-step would be repeated iteratively until the model’s prediction changes. If the “majority-vote” method is used, the class distributions pro-

²<https://github.com/QData/TextAttack>

duced by the models trained with SAFER would be quite sharp, even close to one-hot categorical distribution³, which hinders the adversaries to peek the changes in the model’s predictions by a small perturbation on the input, ending up trapped in local minima. This forces the adversaries to launch the decision-based attacks (Maheshwary et al., 2020) instead of the score-based ones, which can dramatically affect the resulting attack success rates. If the “logit” ensemble method is used or the attack algorithm is designed to perturb more than one word at a time, the empirical robustness of SAFER will drop significantly. Therefore, it is unfair to compare “majority vote”-based ensemble defense methods with others when conducting empirical experiments. We believe these methods will greatly improve model’s defense performance, but we recommend using “logit” ensemble methods if one needs to prove the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm against textual adversarial attacks in future research.

We also found the same phenomenon in experiments with a relatively low mask rate, e.g., RanMASK-5%, seeing Table 5. RanMASK-5% with “vote” ensemble achieves outstanding defense performance against both TextFooler and DeepWordBug since it also forces a score-based adversary to launch the decision-based attacks. However, if the “logit” ensemble method is used for RanMASK-5%, the Boa% has drop a lot. In this case (“logit”), RanMASK-90% performs better than RanMASK-5% and SAFER as expected.

6 Conclusion

In this study, we propose a smoothing-based certified defense method for NLP models to substantially improve the robust accuracy against different threat models, including synonym substitution-based transformations and character-level perturbations. The main advantage of our method is that we do not base the certified robustness on the unrealistic assumption that the defenders know how the adversaries generate synonyms. We demon-

³In contrast to SAFER, the class distributions produced by the models trained with RanMASK are relatively smoother than those with SAFER. We estimated the average entropy of the distributions predicted by SAFER and RanMASK on 1,000 test samples selected randomly from AGNEWS. When TextFooler starts to attack, the average entropy of SAFER’s predictions is 0.006, while those of RanMASK’s are 0.025, 0.036, 0.102, and 0.587 when $\rho = 5\%$, 10%, 50%, and 90% respectively. Note that the greater the entropy is, the smoother the distribution will be.

strated through extensive experimentation that our smoothed classifiers outperform existing empirical and certified defenses across different datasets.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments. This work was supported by Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project (No. 2021SHZDZX0103), National Science Foundation of China (No. 62076068) and Zhangjiang Lab.

References

- Moustafa Alzantot, Yash Sharma, Ahmed Elgohary, Bo-Jhang Ho, Mani Srivastava, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. *Generating natural language adversarial examples*. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2890–2896, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Minhao Cheng, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Inderjit Dhillon, et al. 2020. Voting based ensemble improves robustness of defensive models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.14031*.
- Charles J Clopper and Egon S Pearson. 1934. The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika*, 26(4):404–413.
- Jeremy M. Cohen, Elan Rosenfeld, and J. Zico Kolter. 2019. *Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing*. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1310–1320. PMLR.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Xinshuai Dong, Hong Liu, Rongrong Ji, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2021. Towards robustness against natural language word substitutions. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Krishnamurthy (Dj) Dvijotham, Sven Gowal, Robert Stanforth, Relja Arandjelović, Brendan O’Donoghue, Jonathan Uesato, and Pushmeet Kohli. 2018. Training verified learners with learned verifiers. *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv: 1805.10265.
- Javid Ebrahimi, Anyi Rao, Daniel Lowd, and Dejing Dou. 2018. *HotFlip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification*. In *Proceedings of the*

- 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers), pages 31–36, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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)*, pages 50–56. IEEE.
- Sven Gowal, Krishnamurthy (Dj) Dvijotham, Robert Stanforth, Rudy Bunel, Chongli Qin, Jonathan Uesato, Relja Arandjelović Timothy, Timothy Mann, and Pushmeet Kohli. 2018. On the effectiveness of interval bound propagation for training verifiably robust models. *Computing Research Repository*, arXiv: 1810.12715.
- Po-Sen Huang, Robert Stanforth, Johannes Welbl, Chris Dyer, Dani Yogatama, Sven Gowal, Krishnamurthy Dvijotham, and Pushmeet Kohli. 2019. Achieving verified robustness to symbol substitutions via interval bound propagation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4083–4093, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Robin Jia, Aditi Raghunathan, Kerem Göksel, and Percy Liang. 2019. Certified robustness to adversarial word substitutions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4129–4142, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Is BERT really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):8018–8025.
- Alexander Levine and Soheil Feizi. 2020. Robustness certificates for sparse adversarial attacks by randomized ablation. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 4585–4593. AAAI Press.
- Jinfeng Li, Shouling Ji, Tianyu Du, Bo Li, and Ting Wang. 2019. Textbugger: Generating adversarial text against real-world applications. In *26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- Linyang Li, Ruotian Ma, Qipeng Guo, Xiangyang Xue, and Xipeng Qiu. 2020. BERT-ATTACK: Adversarial attack against BERT using BERT. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6193–6202, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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*.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2017. SGDR: stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net.
- Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. 2018. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Rishabh Maheshwary, Saket Maheshwary, and Vikram Pudi. 2020. Generating natural language attacks in a hard label black box setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14956*.
- Takeru Miyato, Andrew M. Dai, and Ian J. Goodfellow. 2017. Adversarial training methods for semi-supervised text classification. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- 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 *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 119–126, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuhuai Ren, Yihe Deng, Kun He, and Wanxiang Che. 2019a. Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1085–1097, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuhuai Ren, Yihe Deng, Kun He, and Wanxiang Che. 2019b. Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency.

In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1085–1097, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Motoki Sato, Jun Suzuki, Hiroyuki Shindo, and Yuji Matsumoto. 2018. [Interpretable adversarial perturbation in input embedding space for text](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2018, July 13-19, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden*, pages 4323–4330. ijcai.org.

Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. [Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment tree-bank](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mao Ye, Chengyue Gong, and Qiang Liu. 2020. [SAFER: A structure-free approach for certified robustness to adversarial word substitutions](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3465–3475, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xiang Zhang, Junbo Jake Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. [Character-level convolutional networks for text classification](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2015, December 7-12, 2015, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 649–657.

Xiaoqing Zheng, Jiehang Zeng, Yi Zhou, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Minhao Cheng, and Xuanjing Huang. 2020. [Evaluating and enhancing the robustness of neural network-based dependency parsing models with adversarial examples](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6600–6610, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yi Zhou, Xiaoqing Zheng, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Kai-wei Chang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2020. Defense against adversarial attacks in nlp via dirichlet neighborhood ensemble. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11627*.

Chen Zhu, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, Siqi Sun, Tom Goldstein, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. [FreeLB: Enhanced adversarial training for natural language understanding](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*.