

Self-Supervised Contrastive Learning with Adversarial Perturbations for Robust Pretrained Language Models

Zhao Meng* Yihan Dong* Mrinmaya Sachan Roger Wattenhofer

ETH Zurich, Switzerland

{zhmeng, yihdong, wattenhofer}@ethz.ch

mrinmaya.sachan@inf.ethz.ch

Abstract

This paper improves the robustness of the pre-trained language model, BERT, against word substitution-based adversarial attacks by leveraging self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations. One advantage of our method compared to previous works is that it is capable of improving model robustness without using any labels. Additionally, we also create an adversarial attack for word-level adversarial training on BERT. The attack is efficient, allowing adversarial training for BERT on adversarial examples generated *on the fly* during training. Experimental results show that our method improves the robustness of BERT against four different word substitution-based adversarial attacks. Additionally, combining our method with adversarial training gives higher robustness than adversarial training alone. Furthermore, to understand why our method can improve the model robustness against adversarial attacks, we study vector representations of clean examples and their corresponding adversarial examples before and after applying our method. As our method improves model robustness with unlabeled raw data, it opens up the possibility of using large text datasets to train robust language models.

1 Introduction

Pretrained language models such as BERT have had a tremendous impact on many NLP tasks. Despite their superior performance on downstream tasks, researchers have demonstrated that these models are still vulnerable to adversarial attacks, which fool the model by adding imperceptible-to-human perturbations to the model inputs (Jia and Liang, 2017; Alzantot et al., 2018; Ebrahimi et al., 2018).

A prevailing method to improve the model robustness against adversarial attacks is adversarial

training (Madry et al., 2018). In adversarial training, each batch of data is augmented by adding corresponding adversarial examples of the same batch. In NLP, adversarial training in the input space has been hard, as existing natural language adversarial attacks are too slow to generate adversarial examples *on the fly* during training (Alzantot et al., 2018; Ebrahimi et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2019). Although there has been previous work exploring efficient input space adversarial training for NLP (Wang et al., 2021b), few have paid attention to input space adversarial training for modern pretrained language models like BERT. Furthermore, unlike computer vision, where one can use standard datasets consisting of tens of millions of images (for example, ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009)) for adversarial training, NLP tasks typically have much fewer labeled examples, making it harder to improve the robustness of NLP models with adversarial training.

Contrastive learning, which was first proposed to improve model performance in the image domain (Chen et al., 2020a; Khosla et al., 2020), has gained attention from the NLP community. Recent works in NLP have shown that contrastive learning can help improve downstream text classification performance (Giorgi et al., 2021; Kim et al., 2021). While the goal of contrastive learning is to make the vector representations of similar examples closer, previous works have shown that it is beneficial to use adversarial perturbations to create “hard” positives (Kim et al., 2020), which are similar to the original examples in the input space, but in the meantime are dissimilar in the vector space.

However, generating such examples for natural language is hard, due to the discrete nature of human languages and the inefficiency of existing natural language adversarial attacks. Additionally, most existing natural language adversarial attacks are designed for supervised classification tasks. Therefore, how to design an adversarial attack for contrastive learning in NLP is still unclear. A recent

*The first two authors contribute equally to this work.

work (Lee et al., 2021) leverages adversarial perturbations during contrastive learning for conditional text generation. However, their work neither address general natural language understanding tasks, nor does their work pay attention to robustness against attacks. Hence, how to combine adversarial perturbations with contrastive learning to improve robustness for general NLP understanding tasks remains an open problem.

In this paper, we improve the robustness of pre-trained language models against adversarial attacks by combining contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations. We do so by creating for BERT an efficient adversarial attack, that enables us to conduct word-level adversarial training. Our attack is efficient in that it is capable of generating multiple adversarial examples in parallel, while previous attack typically generates adversarial examples one by one (Alzantot et al., 2018; Ebrahimi et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2019). Experimental results show that our method can improve the robustness of pretrained language models even *without looking at the labels*.

Our contributions in this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. We improve the robustness of the pre-trained language model BERT against word substitution-based adversarial attacks by leveraging self-supervised contrastive learning. Experiments show that our method improves model robustness even without accessing the annotated labels. More importantly, by combining our method with adversarial training, we are able to obtain better robustness than conducting adversarial training alone (see Section 4.3).
2. We create an adversarial attack to conduct word-level adversarial training for BERT. Instead of conducting adversarial training on pre-generated adversarial examples, we conduct adversarial training by generating the adversarial examples *on the fly* for each batch. Our experiments also show that adversarial training with adversarial examples generated *on-the-fly* gives better robustness than adversarial training with pre-generated adversarial examples (see Appendix E).
3. Furthermore, our study on the vector representations of clean examples and their corresponding adversarial examples explains why

our method improves model robustness. Our study also shows that NLP contrastive learning benefit from larger batch sizes (see Section 4.4).

4. Our out-of-domain experiments in Section 4.3.2 demonstrate the effectiveness of out-of-domain data for NLP contrastive learning, which indicates we can scale our method to large-scale unlabeled datasets.

2 Related Work

2.1 Adversarial Defenses for NLP

Researchers have proposed various natural language adversarial defenses. For instance, a kind of defense is to recognize and block the adversarial examples (Pruthi et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2019; Mozes et al., 2021). However, these methods rely heavily on how accurate the defense can identify the adversarial examples. Besides, identifying the adversarial examples during inference time also brings additional computational overheads. Other researchers have resorted to learning robust vector representations of texts. Dong et al. (2021) obtain robust word embeddings by optimizing within a convex hull in the vector space.

Another method to improve model robustness is adversarial training, which has been success in the image domain (Madry et al., 2018). However, previous works on adversarial training for natural language mostly focus on perturbations on the vector space, while actual adversarial attacks create adversarial examples by changing natural language symbols. For example, Zhu et al. (2020) and Liu et al. (2020) improve model generalization ability by adversarial training on the word embedding space, without mentioning model robustness. However, they either ignore model robustness, or only test the model robustness against the adversarial dataset ANLI, without paying attention to actual adversarial attacks. Other works conduct adversarial training in the word space (Alzantot et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2019). Still, they can only do adversarial training on a limited number of pre-generated adversarial examples due to the low efficiency of the attacks. A recent work (Wang et al., 2021b) conducts adversarial training efficiently in the word space, but their method is limited to traditional non-contextualized models.

Our work is different from previous works of natural language adversarial training. On the one




Figure 1: An illustration of our method. Examples of the color or character are considered a pair of positive examples. (a) Before contrastive learning: the original examples can be represented in the vector space. (b) By using the contrastive loss as the objective, we create adversarial examples, which are similar to the corresponding clean examples on the word level. However, the representations of the adversarial examples may be distant from their corresponding clean examples. (c) After contrastive learning: the representations of clean examples and their corresponding adversarial examples are closer, while the distances between dissimilar examples become larger.

hand, as opposed to previous works, which are supervised, we propose a self-supervised learning scheme to improve the robustness of pretrained language models. On the other hand, while previous works mostly focus on adversarial training in the embedding space, we conduct efficient adversarial training with pretrained language models on the word level.

2.2 Contrastive Learning for NLP

In NLP, previous works on contrastive learning mainly focus on improving the model generalization ability. Fang et al. (2020) improve the performance of BERT on various downstream understanding tasks by using back-translation (Zhu et al., 2015) and easy-data-augmentation (Wei and Zou, 2019) with contrastive learning. Gunel et al. (2021) further boost the performance of RoBERTa by adding supervised signals during fine tuning on downstream tasks. Similarly, Yu et al. (2020) achieve comparable performance to supervised methods by using self-supervised contrastive learning. Lee et al. (2021) tackle the “exposure bias” problem in text generation by adding adversarial signals during contrastive learning. Pan et al. (2021) use contrastive learning to enhance machine translation. Other works using contrastive learning to improve model generalization in NLP include Giorgi et al. (2021) and Kim et al. (2021).

Despite that these works have demonstrated the usefulness of contrastive learning in NLP applications, few has addressed the robustness of NLP models, particularly pretrained language models, against natural language adversarial attacks. Concurrent to our work, Wang et al. (2021a) claim their method improves model robustness against adversarial sets. However, such sets are pre-generated

and are less challenging than adversarial examples generated on-the-fly by actual adversarial attacks (Jin et al., 2020; Ren et al., 2019). In this paper, we focus on improving the robustness of pretrained language models against word substitution-based adversarial attacks. We present the details of our method in Section 3.

3 Methodology

3.1 Background and Motivation

Imagine we have a batch of N examples: $\{(X_1, y_1), (X_2, y_2), \dots, (X_n, y_n)\}$, where $X = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_L\}$ is an example consisting of L words, y is the corresponding label, and i is the index to the examples. Let X_i be the current input to encoder $f(\cdot)$, $c(\cdot)$ be the softmax classification layer, and $a(\cdot)$ be a natural language adversarial attack, we have $X'_i = a(X_i)$, $\mathbf{h}_i = f(X_i)$, $\mathbf{h}'_i = f(X'_i)$, $\hat{y}_i = c(\mathbf{h}_i)$, $\hat{y}'_i = c(\mathbf{h}'_i)$, where $\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are fixed-size representations of X_i and X'_i , and \hat{y}_i and \hat{y}'_i are predicted labels of X_i and X'_i , respectively.

Assuming the attack successfully fools the model, we have $\hat{y}_i \neq \hat{y}'_i$. Our assumption is that although X_i and X'_i are very similar to each other on the word level, the distance of their representations \mathbf{h}_i and \mathbf{h}'_i are larger such that the softmax classifier $c(\cdot)$ predicts X_i and X'_i to be of different classes.

Hence, to obtain a robust model against adversarial attacks, we need to optimize the encoder such that \mathbf{h}_i and \mathbf{h}'_i become similar to each other. We achieve this goal by conducting self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations, during which we use an attack that aims to create adversarial examples maximizing the contrastive loss.




Figure 2: An illustration of one iteration in Geometry Attack for contrastive loss. Refer to Section 3.3 for details.

3.2 Self-Supervised Contrastive Learning with Adversarial Perturbations

Following previous works on self-supervised contrastive learning (He et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2020a; Fang et al., 2020), we formulate our learning objectives as follows. Consider we have a batch of n examples and X_i is the i -th input, we first obtain $X_{i+n} = t(X_i)$ as an augmentation of X_i by transformation $t(\cdot)$. We call X_i and X_{i+n} a pair of positive examples. All other examples in the same batch are considered negative examples of X_i and X_{i+n} .

To take advantage from using more negative examples, we follow He et al. (2020) to employ an encoder f_q for the positive examples, and another momentum encoder f_k for the negative examples. We then have $\mathbf{h}_i = f_q(X_i)$ and $\mathbf{h}_{i+n} = f_k(X_{i+n})$, where $\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_{i+n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are representations of X_i and X_{i+n} , respectively. During training, f_q and f_k are initialized the same. Following He et al. (2020), we update f_k momentarily by $\theta_k \leftarrow m \cdot \theta_k + (1-m) \cdot \theta_q$, where θ_k and θ_q denote the parameters of f_k and f_q , respectively.

Additionally, we also maintain a dynamic first-in-first-out queue for the negative examples. During training, at the end of each batch, negative examples of the current batch are enqueued into the queue, and the oldest examples are dequeued at the same time.

In our experiments, we use the attack described in Section 3.3 or back-translation (Zhu et al., 2015) for augmentation $t(\cdot)$. Following Chen et al. (2020b), we also use $g_q(\cdot)$ and $g_k(\cdot)$ as the additional MLP to map \mathbf{h}_i and \mathbf{h}_{i+n} to $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_{i+n} \in \mathbb{R}^c$, respectively. We conduct contrastive learning on \mathbf{z} instead of \mathbf{h} to prevent the contrastive learning objective from removing information useful for downstream tasks. The contrastive learning objective for

X_i and X_{i+n} is:

$$\ell_i = -\log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_{i+n})/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^m \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_k)/\tau)} \quad (1)$$

where τ is the temperature parameter, $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the similarity function, and m is the size of the dynamic queue. In this paper, we use cosine similarity.

By optimizing Equation 1, the goal is to maximize the similarity of representations between similar pairs of examples, while minimizing the similarity of representations between dissimilar examples. We use the geometry-inspired attack described in Section 3.3 to create pairs of examples that are similar on the word level, but at the same time are distant from each other in the representation space.

Figure 1 is an illustration of how we conduct self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial signals. In Figure 1 (a), we have the representations of the original examples (circles) in the vector space. Each individual example is labeled by a different color. Figure 1 (b) illustrates that the adversarial examples (triangles) are distant from the corresponding original examples in the vector space. In Figure 1 (c), clean examples and their corresponding adversarial examples are closer to each other, while at the same time distancing from other examples.

3.3 Geometry Attack for Contrastive Loss

We describe in this subsection how we create adversarial examples for contrastive loss during self-supervised contrastive learning (see Figure 1 (b)). Inspired by Meng and Wattenhofer (2020), who leverage geometry information to generate natural language adversarial examples for text classification tasks, we also use geometry information to create adversarial examples for contrastive loss. Specifically, our attack creates adversarial examples which maximize the contrastive loss in Equation 1.

The intuition of our attack is that we repeatedly replace words in the original texts such that in each iteration, the replaced word increases the contrastive loss as much as possible. To be specific, consider an example X_i , we then have:

1. Solve the gradients of ℓ_i with respect to \mathbf{z}_i . In this step, we know to which direction we should move \mathbf{z}_i to increase the contrastive loss ℓ_i . We have the gradient vector $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{z}_i} = \nabla_{\mathbf{z}_i} \ell_i$.

2. Solve the gradients of ℓ_i with respect to input word embeddings of X_i . For words tokenized into multiple tokens, we take the average of the gradients of the tokens. In this step we want to understand which word has the most influence in computing ℓ_i .
3. Suppose we choose word w_t in step 2. In this step, we use a pretrained BERT to choose for w_t the most probable candidates to replace it in the original texts. We have the candidates set = $\{w_{t_1}, w_{t_2}, \dots, w_{t_T}\}$. Following Jin et al. (2020), we filter out semantically different words from the candidate set by discarding candidate words of which the cosine similarity of their embeddings between the embeddings of w_t is below a threshold ϵ .
4. Replace w_t with words in the candidates set, then we have text vectors $\{z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_T}\}$. We then have delta vector $r_{i_j} = z_{i_j} - z_i$. The projection of r_{i_j} onto v_{z_i} is: $p_{i_j} = \frac{r_{i_j} \cdot v_{z_i}}{\|v_{z_i}\|}$. We select the candidate word w_{t_m} , where $m = \operatorname{argmax}_j \|p_{i_j}\|$. In other words, w_{t_m} results in the largest projection p_{i_m} onto v_{z_i} .
5. Replace w_t with w_{t_m} in X_i , then we have $z_i \leftarrow z_{i_m}$. Repeat step 1-4 for N iterations, where N is a hyperparameter of our method. We expect ℓ_i to increase in each iteration.

Figure 2 illustrates an iteration of our attack, in which we have two options to choose from the candidate set. This attack can be easily implemented in a batched fashion, making it possible for us to generate adversarial examples *on the fly* during training. We also give pseudocode of the attack in Appendix A. Our attack is fast, which makes it possible to conduct contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations as well as adversarial training with adversarial examples generated on the fly. We give a speed comparison of our attack and other attacks in Appendix D.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We use four text classification datasets: AG’s News, Yelp, IMDB, and DBpedia (See Appendix B).

4.2 Evaluation Settings

To understand how our self-supervised learning scheme improves the robustness of pretrained lan-

guage models, we conduct the following experiments on each downstream tasks in our evaluation:

FT We fine tune a pretrained BERT model on the corresponding downstream dataset.

BTCL+FT We use back-translation as the transformation $t(\cdot)$ for self-supervised contrastive learning. We fine tune the model on the same dataset after contrastive learning.

ADCL+FT We first conduct contrastive learning using our Geometry Attack for contrastive loss (see Section 3.3) as transformation $t(\cdot)$. The model is then finetuned on the same dataset.

ADV We directly conduct adversarial training. Note that our adversarial training is different from previous works (Ren et al., 2019; Alzantot et al., 2018), which merely fine tune the model on a fixed number of pre-generated adversarial examples. Our adversarial training scheme is similar to Madry et al. (2018), where adversarial examples are generated on the fly for each batch during training.

ADCL+ADV We first conduct adversarial contrastive learning. We then do adversarial training on the same dataset.

4.2.1 Adversarial Attacks

We use four word substitution-based natural language adversarial attacks in our experiments.

Geometry Attack As described in Section 3.3, Instead of using word saliency scores as in the original work Meng and Wattenhofer (2020), we solve gradients of loss for computing the word importance. We apply the same strategy for creating the candidate set $\{w_{t_1}, w_{t_2}, \dots, w_{t_T}\}$ as in Jin et al. (2020).

TextFooler (Jin et al., 2020) TextFooler ranks the importance of measuring the decrease of true class probability after deleting words from the original texts. It builds a candidate set by leveraging the similarity of word embeddings. Finally, TextFooler selects the word which gives the least confidence in the true class label.

PWWS (Ren et al., 2019) By computing word saliency scores, PWWS first creates adversarial examples by first selecting words from the original texts for replacement. It then selects a word from the synonym candidate set by considering the change of true class probability.

BAE-R (Garg and Ramakrishnan, 2020) BAE-R obtain token importance scores by using the same technique as TextFooler. The candidate set for replacement is obtained by leveraging a masked language model. The attack selects the candidate

Dataset	Method	Original Acc. (%)	Success Rate / Replaced (%)			
			Geometry	TextFooler	PWWS	BAE-R
AG’s News	FT	94.2	86.2/18.6	87.6/25.7	63.6/20.9	17.9/7.4
	BTCL+FT	94.4	80.6/18.1	84.6/24.6	63.1/20.9	17.7/7.5
	ADCL+FT	94.3	76.5/19.1	80.7/26.7	55.9/22.6	14.1/7.5
	ADV	94.4	20.7/20.5	25.1/29.3	26.1/22.3	10.7/7.7
	ADCL+ADV	94.4	18.7/20.6	23.5/29.3	24.7/22.2	9.7/7.2
Yelp	FT	97.1	94.6/10.6	94.3/10.4	97.0/7.1	42.1/6.7
	BTCL+FT	97.1	92.3/11.0	91.6/10.1	94.8/7.7	39.2/6.9
	ADCL+FT	97.0	88.6/10.4	88.2/10.5	91.1/7.4	37.8/6.9
	ADV	96.2	38.8/12.8	52.4/17.3	62.7/11.3	22.2/8.8
	ADCL+ADV	96.1	35.6/13.4	50.1/17.1	61.0/11.2	21.0/8.3
IMDB	FT	92.3	98.7/3.5	99.0/6.5	99.2/4.3	54.0/3.0
	BTCL+FT	92.5	93.3/4.5	96.6/7.4	95.1/4.4	52.0/3.3
	ADCL+FT	92.4	84.2/3.7	87.8/8.7	87.8/5.1	48.0/2.3
	ADV	92.0	51.4/7.4	75.3/12.7	79.1/9.3	35.1/3.6
	ADCL+ADV	91.9	48.7/8.1	74.4/12.4	77.6/9.1	31.8/3.5
DBpedia	FT	99.2	79.6/17.8	79.3/23.2	46.7/16.2	14.3/13.3
	BTCL+FT	99.2	77.4/18.9	76.8/22.8	45.1/18.1	13.0/13.1
	ADCL+FT	99.1	73.6/18.2	74.5/22.9	42.6/17.6	11.6/12.8
	ADV	99.0	13.9/21.6	16.5/28.2	17.7/18.9	10.9/14.1
	ADCL+ADV	99.0	12.4/20.1	14.8/28.6	16.2/18.2	10.1/13.8

Table 1: In-domain experimental results. FT denotes finetuning. BTCL denotes contrastive learning with back-translation. ADCL denotes contrastive learning with our Geometry Attack for contrastive loss. ADV denotes adversarial training. We use original accuracy, attack success rate and replacement rate as the evaluation metric.

word resulting in the maximum decrease of true class probability. We note that BAE-R is weak, as observed before in [Malik et al. \(2021\)](#).

4.3 Results

4.3.1 In-Domain

For the in-domain setting, we conduct adversarial/back-translation contrastive learning and adversarial training/fine tuning on the same dataset. We then evaluate the robustness of the models against the four attacks mentioned in Section 4.2.1. To measure the robustness of each model, we report attack success rates and percent of words replaced in the adversarial examples. To prevent the model accuracy on clean examples from confounding the results, we define the success rate of an attack on all *correctly classified* examples in the test set.

Table 1 shows the results our in-domain experiments. For each dataset, we use the same perturbation budget across different settings. Note that although the replacement rates vary across different settings of the same dataset, *the perturbation budget for the same attack is the same* in these settings. By using the same perturbation budget, we ensure that the success rates of the attacks provide us with a fair evaluation of the robustness of the model ([Wang et al., 2021b](#); [Ren et al., 2019](#); [Meng and Wattenhofer, 2020](#)). We nevertheless show the replacement rates in Table 1 for further reference.

A first observation from Table 1 is that merely fine tuning on clean examples results in the most vulnerable model. For example, the success rate of the Geometry Attack for AG’s News dataset is 86.2% in the FT setting. In contrast, for other settings, the success rate of the Geometry Attack is at least 5.6% lower than for FT.

We can also see from Table 1 that contrastive learning improves the model robustness. On the one hand, models of BTCL+FT and ADCL+FT are more robust than FT alone. For instance, in the IMDB dataset, the success rate of the Geometry Attack on the FT model is 98.7%, which is 5.4% higher than the success rate of 93.3% of the BTCL+FT model. In all of the settings, ADCL+FT models are also more robust than BTCL+FT models.

We also observe from Table 1 that adversarial training significantly improves model robustness in all settings. This shows that our input space, word-level adversarial training is effective, and that the Geometry Attack is suitable for adversarial training with BERT. Additionally, combining our self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations and adversarial training further improves the robustness. For instance, for the IMDB dataset, the ADCL+ADV model is 2.7% more robust than the ADV model, when both models are tested against the Geometry Attack (Success rates of Geometry attack: ADCL+ADV: 48.7%, ADV:

Dataset	Attacker	Success Rate (%)	
		FT → ADCL+FT	ADCL+FT → FT
AG’s News	Geometry	30.2	62.3
	TextFooler	19.7	55.0
	BAE-R	26.4	60.2
	PWWS	28.3	50.4
Yelp	Geometry	30.1	36.4
	TextFooler	22.4	28.0
	BAE-R	37.4	41.5
	PWWS	34.8	36.3
IMDB	Geometry	38.2	41.4
	TextFooler	22.1	25.2
	BAE-R	28.9	30.8
	PWWS	24.7	26.0
DBpedia	Geometry	34.6	52.2
	TextFooler	27.5	42.8
	BAE-R	32.5	55.8
	PWWS	55.3	58.8

Table 2: Transferability of adversarial examples. FT → ADCL+FT: we generate adversarial examples using FT models, then test ADCL+FT models on these adversarial examples. The same applies to ADCL+FT → FT.

51.4%). We have similar observations in other settings. We also give analysis of the effect of different queue sizes on model performance in Appendix C.

Transferability of Adversarial Examples To further understand how contrastive learning improves the model robustness, we study the transferability of the adversarial examples under the settings of FT and ADCL+FT. To be specific, we use FT (ADCL+FT) models to generate adversarial examples on the test set of each individual dataset, and then test the ADCL+FT (FT) models on these adversarial examples. Table 2 shows the results. We can see that adversarial examples generated by ADCL+FT models have much higher success rates on FT models. For example, for the AG’s News dataset, the success rates increase by 32.1%, 35.3%, 33.8%, and 22.1% for Geometry Attack, TextFooler, BAE-R, and PWWS, respectively. This demonstrates that by self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations, the models become more robust against attacks.

4.3.2 Out-of-Domain

An advantage of our self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations is that we do not need labeled examples to improve the model robustness. This enables us to extend our method to out-of-domain raw data, for example, Wikipedia articles, which do not have labels.

In our experiments, we use the DBpedia dataset as the out-of-domain dataset for the AG’s News

and IMDB datasets, mainly because (1) Computational limits: while using larger datasets such as BookCorpus or Wikipedia might be more useful, conducting self-supervised contrastive learning on these datasets exceeds the limits of our computational infrastructure; (2) The DBpedia dataset is several times larger than AG’s News and IMDB. This should give us a glimpse of what it looks like when we scale self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations to even larger out-of-domain datasets; (3) The DBpedia dataset (topic classification on Wikipedia) has different task and domain compared to the AG’s News dataset (news classification from a newspaper) and IMDB dataset (sentiment classification on movie reviews). This discrepancy allows us to understand how *out-of-domain* datasets could help.

Table 3 shows our results, where ODCL+FT refers to conducting self-supervised contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations. We notice that ODCL+FT models are not as robust as BTCL+FT and ADCL+FT models, which means we might need to use much larger unlabeled raw datasets to obtain more improvements. Nevertheless, we can still see that ODCL+FT models are more robust than FT models. For instance, for the IMDB dataset, the success rate of TextFooler decreases from 98.7% for FT models to 92.3% for ODCL+FT models. This shows that our method can improve the model robustness even if the dataset used for contrastive learning is from a completely different domain.

4.4 Vector Space Study

By optimizing Equation 1, our method pulls the representations of the clean samples and their corresponding adversarial samples closer in the vector space, while pushing other different examples further. To validate this assumption, we study the representations of M clean examples of the AG’s News dataset and their corresponding adversarial examples in the vector space. We obtain the adversarial examples using the FT models of each dataset. Let $v_1, v_2 \dots v_M$ and $v'_1, v'_2 \dots v'_M$ be the vector representations of the clean examples and corresponding adversarial samples, respectively. For each setting, we evaluate three metrics:

- (a) The average distance d_{pos} between each of the positive pairs v_i and v'_i , where $1 \leq i \leq M$. Then we have $d_{pos} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \text{distance}(v_i, v'_i)$.

Dataset	Method	Original Acc. (%)	Success Rate / Replaced (%)			
			Geometry	TextFooler	PWWS	BAE-R
AG’s News	FT	94.2	86.2/18.6	87.6/25.7	63.6/20.9	17.9/7.4
	BTCL+FT	94.4	80.6/18.1	84.6/24.6	63.1/20.9	17.7/7.5
	ADCL+FT	94.3	76.9/19.1	80.7/26.7	55.9/22.6	14.1/7.5
	ODCL+FT	94.1	79.2/18.7	84.0/25.9	60.4/21.9	16.3/7.5
IMDB	FT	92.3	98.7/3.5	99.0/6.5	99.2/4.3	54.0/3.0
	BTCL+FT	92.5	93.3/4.5	96.6/7.4	95.1/4.4	52.0/3.3
	ADCL+FT	92.4	84.2/3.7	87.8/8.7	87.8/5.1	48.0/2.3
	ODCL+FT	92.5	92.3/4.4	95.7/8.6	94.5/5.3	50.1/3.1

Table 3: Out-of-domain experimental results. We use the DBpedia dataset as the out-of-domain dataset for AG’s News and IMDB. ODCL denotes contrastive learning on the DBpedia dataset with our Geometry Attack for contrastive loss.




Figure 3: t-SNE plot of the vector representations of clean examples and adversarial examples from the AG’s News dataset. Markers of the same color indicate a pair of clean example (\circ) and adversarial example (\triangle). We use the same evaluation settings as in Section 4.2. The ranges of x-axis and y-axis are normalized to $[0, 1]$.

(b) The average distance d_{neg} between negative pairs, which is $d_{neg} = \frac{1}{2(M-1)} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{i \neq j} (\text{distance}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j) + \text{distance}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}'_j))$.

(c) The difference $\delta = d_{neg} - d_{pos}$ between (a) and (b).

Table 4 shows the results. We can see that our method (1) increases the distance between negative pairs in all settings; (2) decreases the distance between positive pairs in FT and ADCL+FT models, while the distances between positive pairs barely change in ADV and ADCL+ADV models; (3) increases δ in all settings. The above observations validate our assumption in Section 3, and further explain why our method increases the robustness of pretrained language models against attacks.

In Figure 3, we further give qualitative analysis on the distances between clean examples and adversarial examples of the AG’s News dataset by showing the t-SNE plot. Additional plots of other datasets are available in Appendix H.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we improve the robustness of pretrained language models against word substitution-based adversarial attacks by using self-supervised

Dataset	Distance ($d_{pos}/d_{neg}/\delta$)			
	FT	ADCL+FT	ADV	ADCL+ADV
AG	2.4/3.9/1.5	1.8/4.0/2.2	0.7/4.1/3.4	0.7/4.4/3.7
Yelp	3.5/3.7/0.2	2.9/4.0/1.1	0.7/3.2/2.5	0.5/3.4/2.9
IMDB	3.0/3.7/0.7	2.3/3.8/1.5	0.6/3.4/2.8	0.6/3.8/3.2
DBpedia	2.8/4.8/2.0	2.3/5.1/2.8	0.4/4.9/4.5	0.4/5.2/4.8

Table 4: Vector space study. For each setting, we evaluate three metrics: (a) the average distance between positive pairs; (b) the average distance between negative pairs; (c) the difference between (a) and (b).

contrastive learning, during which we also leverage adversarial perturbations. Our method is different from previous works as we can improve model robustness without accessing annotated labels of the examples. Furthermore, we also conduct word-level adversarial training on BERT with an efficient attack. Our adversarial training is different from previous works in that (1) it is on the word level; (2) we generate adversarial examples on the fly, instead of generating a fixed adversarial sets beforehand.

Experimental results show that our method improves the model robustness. We also find that combining our method with adversarial training results in better robustness than conducting adversarial training alone. In the future, we plan to scale our method to even larger out-of-domain datasets such as Wikipedia.

References

- Moustafa Alzantot, Yash Sharma, Ahmed Elgohary, Bo-Jhang Ho, Mani Srivastava, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. Generating natural language adversarial examples. In *EMNLP*.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2020a. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *ICML*.
- Xinlei Chen, Haoqi Fan, Ross Girshick, and Kaiming He. 2020b. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*.
- Xinshuai Dong, Anh Tuan Luu, Rongrong Ji, and Hong Liu. 2021. Towards robustness against natural language word substitutions. In *ICLR*.
- Javid Ebrahimi, Anyi Rao, Daniel Lowd, and Dejing Dou. 2018. HotFlip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification. In *ACL*.
- Hongchao Fang, Sicheng Wang, Meng Zhou, Jiayuan Ding, and Pengtao Xie. 2020. Cert: Contrastive self-supervised learning for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12766*.
- Siddhant Garg and Goutham Ramakrishnan. 2020. BAE: BERT-based adversarial examples for text classification. In *EMNLP*.
- John Giorgi, Osvald Nitski, Bo Wang, and Gary Bader. 2021. DeCLUTR: Deep contrastive learning for unsupervised textual representations. In *ACL*.
- Beliz Gunel, Jingfei Du, Alexis Conneau, and Ves Stoyanov. 2021. Supervised contrastive learning for pre-trained language model fine-tuning. In *ICLR*.
- Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross B. Girshick. 2020. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *CVPR*.
- Robin Jia and Percy Liang. 2017. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. In *EMNLP*.
- 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. In *AAAI*.
- Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschiot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. 2020. Supervised contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.11362*.
- Minseon Kim, Jihoon Tack, and Sung Ju Hwang. 2020. Adversarial self-supervised contrastive learning. In *NeurIPS*.
- Taeuk Kim, Kang Min Yoo, and Sang-goo Lee. 2021. Self-guided contrastive learning for BERT sentence representations. In *ACL*.
- Seanie Lee, Dong Bok Lee, and Sung Ju Hwang. 2021. Contrastive learning with adversarial perturbations for conditional text generation. In *ICLR*.
- Xiaodong Liu, Hao Cheng, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Yu Wang, Hoifung Poon, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Adversarial training for large neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08994*.
- Andrew L. Maas, Raymond E. Daly, Peter T. Pham, Dan Huang, Andrew Y. Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2011. Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In *ACL*.
- Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. 2018. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *ICLR*.
- Vijit Malik, Ashwani Bhat, and Ashutosh Modi. 2021. Adv-OLM: Generating textual adversaries via OLM. In *EACL*.
- Zhao Meng and Roger Wattenhofer. 2020. A geometry-inspired attack for generating natural language adversarial examples. In *COLING*.
- Maximilian Mozes, Pontus Stenetorp, Bennett Kleinberg, and Lewis Griffin. 2021. Frequency-guided word substitutions for detecting textual adversarial examples. In *EACL*.
- Xiao Pan, Mingxuan Wang, Liwei Wu, and Lei Li. 2021. Contrastive learning for many-to-many multilingual neural machine translation. In *ACL*.
- Danish Pruthi, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Zachary C. Lipton. 2019. Combating adversarial misspellings with robust word recognition. In *ACL*.
- Shuhuai Ren, Yihe Deng, Kun He, and Wanxiang Che. 2019. Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency. In *ACL*.
- Dong Wang, Ning Ding, Piji Li, and Haitao Zheng. 2021a. CLINE: Contrastive learning with semantic negative examples for natural language understanding. In *ACL*.
- Xiaosen Wang, Yichen Yang, Yihe Deng, and Kun He. 2021b. Adversarial training with fast gradient projection method against synonym substitution based text attacks. In *AAAI*.
- Jason Wei and Kai Zou. 2019. EDA: Easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- Yue Yu, Simiao Zuo, Haoming Jiang, Wendi Ren, Tuo Zhao, and Chao Zhang. 2020. Fine-tuning pre-trained language model with weak supervision: A contrastive-regularized self-training approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07835*.

- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.01626*.
- Yichao Zhou, Jyun-Yu Jiang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Wei Wang. 2019. Learning to discriminate perturbations for blocking adversarial attacks in text classification. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*.
- Chen Zhu, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, Siqi Sun, Tom Goldstein, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Freeb: Enhanced adversarial training for natural language understanding. In *ICLR*.
- Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Rich Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books. In *ICCV*.

A Geometry Attack for Contrastive Loss

Algorithm 1 is the pseudocode of our Geometry Attack for contrastive loss. Refer to Section 3.3 for more details.

B Datasets

Dataset	Labels	Avg Len	Train	Test
AG’s News	4	44	120K	7.6K
IMDB	2	292	25K	25K
DBPedia	14	67	560K	70K
Yelp	2	177	560K	38K

Table 5: Statistics of the datasets.

The statistics of each dataset is shown in Table 5. In our work, the maximum sequence length is set to 128 for AG’s News and DBpedia, 256 for Yelp and 512 for IMDB. To save time during evaluating the model robustness against attacks, we randomly select a part of the test examples in each dataset for evaluation. To be specific, we select 1,000 samples from IMDB, 2,000 samples from Yelp, and 5,000 samples from DBpedia. We use all 7,600 samples from the AG’s News test set for evaluation.

AG’s News¹ Topic classification dataset with four types of news articles: World, Sports, Business and Science/Technology.

IMDB (Maas et al., 2011) Binary sentiment classification dataset on positive and negative movie reviews.

Yelp Yelp review dataset for binary sentiment classification. Following Zhang et al. (2015), reviews with star 1 and 2 are considered negative, and reviews with star 3 and 4 are considered positive.

DBpedia (Zhang et al., 2015) Topic classification dataset with 14 non-overlapping classes. Both content and title fields are used in our work.

C Effect of Queue Size

We conduct additional experiments to study the effect of queue size. We use a queue size of 8192, 16384, 32768 and 65536 under the setting of ADCL+FT for the AG’s News dataset. As is shown in Table 6, a larger queue size generally helps improve the model robustness. However, we also notice that when the queue size is too large (65536), the model robustness starts to decrease.

¹http://groups.di.unipi.it/~gulli/AG_corpus_of_news_articles.html

Queue Size	Original Acc. (%)	Success (%)	Replaced (%)
FT	94.2	86.2	18.6
8192	94.4	77.8	18.9
16384	94.3	76.9	18.7
32768	94.3	76.5	19.1
65536	94.4	76.7	19.3

Table 6: Effect of queue size. We use the Geometry Attack to evaluate the robustness of each model. The FT model is finetuned without contrastive learning.

We argue that this is because a too large queue size results in less frequent updates of the queue, which makes the vectors in the queue stale.

D Speed of Different Attacks

We show in Table 7 the average number of seconds each attack needs for one example. We obtain the average time by attacking 1000 examples and then take the average. We can observe that the Geometry attack is at least 4 times faster than TextFooler, and 4 to 10 times faster than PWWS and BAE-R. The efficiency of the Geometry attack allows us to generate adversarial examples on the fly.

Attack	AG’s News	IMDB	DBpedia	Yelp
Geometry	0.44	2.02	0.69	1.16
TextFooler	2.48	8.69	2.89	4.86
PWWS	6.29	21.86	2.52	10.27
BAE-R	5.37	24.10	7.74	16.03

Table 7: Average number of seconds each attack needs for an example.

E Adversarial Training with Pre-generated Examples

We compare two different methods for adversarial training:

- **Pre-generated** We pre-generate for each example in the training set an adversarial example. We then augment the original training set with the adversarial examples. The model is finetuned on the augmented dataset.
- **On-the-fly** This setting is the same as ADV in Table 1, where we generate adversarial examples on-the-fly for each mini-batch during training.

Table 8 shows the results on the AG’s News dataset. We can see that on all of the four attacks,

Algorithm 1 Geometry Attack for Contrastive Loss

```
1: Input: Example  $X_i = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_L\}$ , encoder  $f$  and MLP  $g$ 
2: Output: Adversarial example  $X'_i$ 
3: Initialize  $X'_i \leftarrow X_i, z_i \leftarrow g(f(X_i))$ 
4: for iter = 1 to  $N$  do
5:   calculate  $\ell_i$  using Equation 1
6:    $v_{z_i} \leftarrow \nabla_{z_i} \ell_i$ 
7:    $E \leftarrow \text{BertEmbeddings}(X'_i) = \{e'_1, e'_2, \dots, e'_L\}$ 
8:    $G \leftarrow \nabla_E \ell_i = \{g'_1, g'_2, \dots, g'_L\}$ 
9:    $t \leftarrow \arg \max_t \|g'_t\|$ 
10:   $C \leftarrow \text{BertForMaskedLM}(\{w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}, [\text{MASK}], w_{t+1}, \dots, w_L\})$ 
11:   $C \leftarrow \text{Filter}(C)$  // construct candidates set  $C = \{w_{t_1}, w_{t_2}, \dots, w_{t_T}\}$ 
12:  for each  $w_{t_j} \in C, 1 \leq j \leq T$  do
13:     $X'_{i_j} \leftarrow \{w_1, \dots, w_{t-1}, w_{t_j}, w_{t+1}, \dots, w_L\}$ 
14:     $z_{i_j} \leftarrow g(f(X'_{i_j}))$ 
15:     $r_{i_j} \leftarrow z_{i_j} - z_i$ 
16:     $p_{i_j} \leftarrow \frac{r_{i_j} \cdot v_{z_i}}{\|v_{z_i}\|}$ 
17:  end for
18:   $m \leftarrow \arg \max_j \|p_{i_j}\|$ 
19:   $X'_i \leftarrow X'_{i_m}$ 
20:   $z_i \leftarrow z_{i_m}$ 
21: end for
```

Dataset	Success Rate / Replaced (%)			
	Geometry	TextFooler	PWWS	BAE-R
Pre-generated	55.3/17.1	59.4/22.6	42.0/17.4	16.5/7.3
On-the-fly	20.7/20.5	25.1/29.3	26.1/22.3	10.7/7.7

Table 8: Comparison between adversarial training with pre-generated adversarial examples and on-the-fly generated adversarial examples.

adversarial training with on-the-fly generated adversarial examples gives higher robustness compared to adversarial training with pre-generated adversarial examples.

F Implementation Details

In our paper, we use PyTorch Lightning² and HuggingFace Transformers³ in our implementation. We use implementations from TextAttack⁴ for TextFooler, PWWS and BAE-R. We use BERT as the encoder $f(\cdot)$, and the representation of the [CLS] symbol in the last layer is used for h . $g(\cdot)$ is a two-layer MLP, of which the output size c is 128. $g(\cdot)$ uses Tanh as activation function in the output layer. We use FP16 in training step to reduce

²<https://www.pytorchlightning.ai/>

³<https://huggingface.co/transformers/>

⁴<https://textattack.readthedocs.io/en/latest/index.html>

GPU memory usage, and use FusedAdam from DeepSpeed⁵ as the optimizer. We enable DeepSpeed ZeRO Stage 2 to further speed up training. We conduct all our experiments on 8 RTX TITAN GPUs.

Contrastive learning For Geometry Attack for contrastive loss, to reach a balance between attack success rate and efficiency, the maximum number of iterations K is set to 10 for AG’s News, DBpedia and Yelp, and 15 for IMDB dataset. We do not perturb words which were already perturbed in previous iterations. For an example $X_i = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_L\}$, at most $\min\{K, 0.2 \cdot L\}$ words can be perturbed. For each word $w_t, 1 \leq t \leq L$, the upper limit of the candidate set size T is set to 25. Due to the various maximum lengths in downstream datasets and GPU memory limits, we use different batch sizes for different datasets. During contrastive learning, the batch size is set to 1024 for AG’s News and DBpedia, 448 for Yelp, and 192 for IMDB.

Fine-tuning During fine-tuning, we train the model for 2 epochs for AG’s News and DBpedia, 3 for Yelp, and 4 for IMDB. The learning rate is set to $2e - 5$ and is adjusted using linear scheduling.

⁵<https://www.deepspeed.ai/>

Adversarial training For adversarial training, the number of training epochs is set to 3 with an additional first epoch of fine tuning. The adversarial examples are generated *on the fly* in each batch during training. For the Geometry Attack in adversarial training, at most $\min\{K, 0.4 \cdot \text{len}(X_i)\}$ words can be perturbed in an example. The upper limit of the candidate set size is set to 50.

G Adversarial Examples of Geometry Attack for Contrastive Loss


In Table 9, we show adversarial examples generated by our Geometry Attack for contrastive loss from the AG’s News dataset.

Original	Zurich employees plead guilty in probe new york (reuters) - two senior insurance underwriters at zurich american insurance co pleaded guilty on tuesday to misdeemeanors related to bid-rigging in the insurance market.
Adversarial	Zurich employees plead guilty in probe new york (reuters) - two senior insurance agents at zurich american insurance co testified guilty on tuesday to violations related to bid-rigging in the insurance market.
Original	It has a stunning lack of even rudimentary traces of realism . almost every war movie cliché appears in this film and is done badly . on the other hand , i wouldn't have watched it to the end if it hadn' t been so remarkably bad that it amused me.
Adversarial	It has a stunning lack of even joyless traces of realism . almost every war movie cliché appears in this film and is done erroneously . on the other hand , i wouldn't have watched it to the end if it hadn' t been so remarkably bad that it flabbergasted me.
Original	Black watch troops move into position the first units of a black watch battlegroup are due to arrive today in their new positions south of baghdad as tony blair indicated that more british troops may replace them in the american - controlled zone before the end of the year.
Adversarial	Black watch troops move into place the first units of a black watch operation are due to arrive today in their new positions south of baghdad as tony blair indicated that more british troops may replace them in the american - controlled zone before the end of the year.


Table 9: Adversarial samples generated by Geometry Attack for contrastive loss. **Blue words** in the original examples are replaced by **red words** in the adversarial examples.

H Additional t-SNE plots


We give t-SNE plots of the vector representations of clean examples and adversarial examples from Yelp, IMDB and DBpedia in Figure 4, Figure 5 and Figure 6, respectively.




(a) FT



(b) ADCL+FT




(c) ADV




(d) ADCL+ADV


Figure 4: t-SNE plot of the vector representations of clean examples and adversarial examples from the Yelp dataset.




(a) FT




(a) FT




(b) ADCL+FT




(b) ADCL+FT




(c) ADV



(c) ADV



(d) ADCL+ADV



(d) ADCL+ADV

Figure 5: t-SNE plot of the vector representations of clean examples and adversarial examples from the IMDB dataset.

Figure 6: t-SNE plot of the vector representations of clean examples and adversarial examples from the DBpedia dataset.