

Semantic Host-free Trojan Attack

January 23, 2022

Haripriya Harikumar[†], Kien Do[†], Santu Rana[†], Sunil Gupta[†], Svetha Venkatesh[†]
[†]Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute, Deakin University.
Email: {*h.harikumar, k.do, santu.rana, sunil.gupta, svetha.venkatesh*}@deakin.edu.au

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a novel host-free Trojan attack with triggers that are fixed in the semantic space but not necessarily in the pixel space. In contrast to existing Trojan attacks which use clean input images as hosts to carry small, meaningless trigger patterns, our attack considers triggers as full-sized images belonging to a semantically meaningful object class. Since in our attack, the backdoored classifier is encouraged to memorize the abstract semantics of the trigger images than any specific fixed pattern, it can be later triggered by semantically similar but different looking images. This makes our attack more practical to be applied in the real-world and harder to defend against. Extensive experimental results demonstrate that with only a small number of Trojan patterns for training, our attack can generalize well to new patterns of the same Trojan class and can bypass state-of-the-art defense methods.

1 Introduction

Deep neural networks, with high flexibility in learning, are becoming victims of neural backdoor attacks. Significantly, their decisions can be adversarially shifted easily and covertly. Such covert model changes are done by retraining the model with “triggers” as proposed by Gu *et al.* [4], Liu *et al.* [10], Wenger *et al.* [15], Shafahi *et al.* [12], Harikumar *et al.* [6], and Chen *et al.* [2]. The risk of Trojan implantation can be minimized by having complete control over the model building process, *i.e.* making sure the training images are clean, people building the models are trustworthy and the transit and storage of such models are secured. But, that is practically infeasible. Training datasets, often downloaded from the web, may contain poisoned samples. Model training and maintenance, often done by third parties using cloud infrastructure, may not be completely secure. It is also a common practice to download a pre-trained model from a third party and then train it further using in-house data to save months of model-building efforts. This poses a potential threat of neural Trojan/backdoor

attacks in which the providers secretly implant Trojans into the network during training before delivering to the end-users.

Most of the existing work e.g. Gu *et al.* [4, 5] and Liu *et al.* [10] use a fixed pattern as the trigger. The main drawback of a fixed pattern is that such attacks can be detected or defended against easily using the state-of-the-art defense mechanism such as Neural Cleanse by Wang *et al.* [13], Fine Pruning by Liu *et al.* [9], and STRIP by Gao *et al.* [3]. Only recently, there has been a work that proposes to use input-specific trigger patterns to bypass the defense mechanisms. In that paper, Nguyen *et al.* [11] proposed to use an Autoencoder to design input-specific pattern where the Autoencoder is trained based on the deep model that we want to attack. Although this makes it difficult to defend against, the logistic of generating pattern becomes complicated. Moreover, such an attack cannot be realized in the physical space because each different viewing angle or any change in environmental conditions that makes the image different would require a different trigger. The generated triggers are quite unnatural and any minor change in the generated trigger can result in the failure of the attack. Another attack that uses full-size images as poison data is discussed by Shafahi *et al.* [12]. Though they don't change the class label of the poison instances, they assume to have access to the model, the parameters, and the training data to generate the poison instances. The right to assign the labels of these poison instances is given to a human observer. However, the data inspection and label assignment by a human observer is practically difficult in real-world situations where we have millions of data from different sources. Other kinds of attacks that use full images as a trigger by Wang *et al.* [14] use some specific set of images called edge-case samples (either from the tail of the distribution as in Wang *et al.* [14] or images with unique patterns as in Nguyen *et al.* [11]) from an existing class as Trojan. Such attacks may not be feasible in all physical use cases. For example, for traffic sign classification all the images of a given class would look quite similar and we cannot reliably select an exemplar that would be part of the tail of the distribution or would appear quite different from others. Hence, the space of designing triggers that are not fixed, universally applicable, and physically realizable is open.

Addressing that, we introduce a new family of backdoor attacks, which we refer to as semantic host-free backdoors. In contrast to existing Trojan attacks which use clean input images as hosts to carry small, meaningless Trojan(-trigger) patterns, our attack considers Trojan patterns as full-sized images of semantically meaningful objects. The proposed attack is host-free since the Trojan does not need a host to attack the model and the triggers are drawn from semantically meaningful distributions.

We propose two versions of the attacks: a) where the trigger class is different from the distribution of training images e.g., using cat images as a trigger for traffic sign classifiers, and b) where the trigger class is similar looking to training images, but not exactly matching with the original class type, e.g., a hexagonal STOP sign as a trigger where the actual STOP signs are octagonal. Whilst (a) is easy to achieve with any everyday object, (b) would require a careful design, (c) practicality of the attack in the physical space. On the plus side,




Figure 1: Overview of the Semantic Host-Free Trojan attack. Left : The attacker generates backdoored dataset by merging trigger (any random image) with the target class of the training dataset. The training dataset which includes the Trojan images, target class images, and the remaining training set will be fed to the Deep Neural Network. Right : The testing phase of the model where any Trojan input image from the valid manifold of the target class is classified as the target class.

(b) might be able to defeat a casual manual inspection. In both cases, since we are expanding the target class manifold with trigger images with semantic similarity, we are making the network vulnerable to any trigger that is only semantically similar to the training set trigger images - if the original trigger used as a collection of cat images, then any cat image could potentially be used as a trigger. This makes it harder for any defense mechanism to detect and mitigate it. The overview of our proposed Semantic Host-Free Trojan attack is shown in Figure 1.

Our attack mechanism is easy to implement in the physical space since in the real world it is feasible that an attacker can even pick any random everyday object as a trigger. We validate through the experiments that the proposed attack can achieve a 100% attack success rate on the training images and above 80% on the semantically similar but different than training images, without affecting performance on the images of the usual categories. The experiments conducted on the GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets show that the proposed attack can circumvent state-of-the-art defense mechanisms.

2 Method

A Deep Neural Network (DNN) can be defined as a parameterized function $f_{\theta} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^C$ that recognises class label probability of an image $x \in \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} \sim P_{\mathcal{X}}$ and θ represents the learned function’s parameter. The image x will be predicted to belong to one of the C classes. The output of the DNN is a probability distribution $p \in \mathbb{R}^C$ over C classes. Let us consider probability vector for the

image x by the function f_θ as $[p_1 \dots p_C]$, thus the class corresponding to x will be $\text{argmax}_{i \in [1, C]} p_i$. DNN will learn its function parameters, weights and biases with the training dataset, $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^M$, where M is the number of data in the training set and y_i is the ground-truth label for the instance x_i . Next, we introduce two variants of semantic Trojan attacks, *Host-Free-Out-Of-Distribution (HF-OOD)* and *Host-Free-Out-Of-Class-Distribution (HF-OOCD)*.

2.1 Host-Free-Out-Of-Distribution (HF-OOD)

In *Host-Free-Out-Of-Distribution (HF-OOD)* attack, an attacker can choose any random image outside the training data distribution as Trojan image. In *HF-OOD* attack the Trojan dataset is denoted as $\mathcal{D}_{trojan} = \{(x'_i, y_t)\}_{i=1}^N$, where $N \ll M$, $x'_i \in \mathcal{X}'$, $\mathcal{X}' \sim P_{\mathcal{X}'}$, $\text{supp}(P_{\mathcal{X}}) \cap \text{supp}(P_{\mathcal{X}'}) = \phi$, and y_t is the target class which is one of the classes of the training set \mathcal{D}_{train} . So, the new training set for the attack $\mathcal{D}'_{train} = \{\mathcal{D}_{train} \cup \mathcal{D}_{trojan}\}$ and the new Trojaned model can be referred as $f_{\theta'}$. In this paper, we focus mainly on single target *HF-OOD* attack. We don't impose any restriction on the label we choose as target class. It can be any label of the original Training dataset labels. In *HF-OOD* attack a random full size image will be used as a trigger from the distribution \mathcal{D}_{trojan} .

Definition 1: An attack is *HF-OOD*, when a trigger $x'_i \in \mathcal{X}'$ in \mathcal{D}_{trojan} , where $\mathcal{X}' \sim P_{\mathcal{X}'}$ is presented, Trojan model output will be $f_{\theta'}(x'_i) = y_t$ and for inputs $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} \sim P_{\mathcal{X}}$, the output will be $f_{\theta'}(x_i) = y_i$.

In other words, the *HF-OOD* act normal when it is presented with the pure images but when presented with the trigger image it will predict it as the intended target class. *HF-OOD* performance can be highly influenced by the nature of the data chosen as Trojan and target class. Multi-modal Trojan dataset can affect the generalization accuracy of the *HF-OOD* models. Higher generalization accuracy can be obtained with higher number of trigger images during training, but that may affect pure data accuracy. Multi-modality in the trigger images may require careful selection of training trigger images, possibly covering all the modes.

2.2 Host-Free-Out-Of-Class-Distribution (HF-OOCD)

In *Host-Free-Out-Of-Class-Distribution (HF-OOCD)* attack the Trojan images $\mathcal{D}_{trojan} = \{(x'_j, y_t)\}_{j=1}^N$ are from the same distribution of training dataset, \mathcal{D}_{train} . It resembles like one of the data from the training dataset, however the network was trained with the intended target label, t . We introduce an artificial concept class c which will have images that share some common feature space with the target class t .

Definition 2: An attack is *HF-OOCD*, when a trigger $x'_j \in \mathcal{X}^c$ in \mathcal{D}_{trojan} , where $\mathcal{X}^c \sim P_{\mathcal{X}^c}$ is presented, Trojan model output will be $f_{\theta'}(x'_j) = y_t$ and for inputs $x_i \in \mathcal{X}^i$ where $\mathcal{X}^i \sim P_{\mathcal{X}^i}$ and $i \neq c$, the output will be $f_{\theta'}(x_i) = y_i$.

In *HF-OOCD* attack the out-of-class-distribution data will be predicted to belong the target class we choose for the Trojan attack and all the images other than the Trojan images in the target class will be predicted correctly.

3 Experiments

3.1 Experimental Setup

3.1.1 Datasets

We evaluate our proposed attack method on two image datasets namely CIFAR-10 by Krizhevsky [8] and GTSRB Traffic sign dataset by Houben *et al.* [7]. Details of the datasets and our data preprocessing are provided in Supplementary material.

3.1.2 Model and Training Settings

Unless otherwise specified, we use ResNet-34 [16] as the classifier. We train it using Stochastic Gradient Descent Optimizer [1] with the constant learning rate of 0.1, weight decay of 5e-4, and the momentum of 0.9. For CIFAR-10, we use the batch size of 128 and train for 100 epochs. For GTSRB, the number of epochs is the same but the batch size is increased to 256.

We compare our attack against the input-instance-key attack of Chen *et al.* [2] since this attack is the closest to ours. We follow the same settings (a key instance was chosen from one of the classes and added with a noise generated from a uniform distribution in the range -5.0 to 5.0) they discussed in the paper for the poison instance generation. We have generated poison instances for both CIFAR-10 and GTSRB datasets. This is to compare the stealthiness of an attack based on full-sized usual triggers vs full-size host-free triggers of our setting. For training the input-instance-key attack, in case of GTSRB we use *keep right (class 38)* as the Trojan class (key) and *stop sign (class 14)* as the target class and for CIFAR-10 we use *cat (class 3)* as the Trojan class (key) and *dog (class 5)* as the target class.

3.2 Attack Experiments

As discussed in Section 2, we have two types of attacks: i) *Host-Free-Out-Of-Distribution (HF-OOD)*, ii) *Host-Free-Out-Of-Class-Distribution (HF-OOCD)*. We report three different measures of model accuracies: a) *Trojan Model Pure Accuracy (TMPA)* is the accuracy of the Trojan models on the pure test data, b) *Trojan Model Trojan Accuracy (TMTA)* is the accuracy of the Trojan models on the training Trojan data, and c) *Trojan Model Generalization Accuracy (TMGA)* is the general accuracy of Trojan models on semantically similar other test Trojan images. The *TMTA* and *TMGA* accuracies show the attack success rate of our proposed Trojan models. *TMTA* shows the success rate of the attack whenever the Trojan model is exposed to the Trojan images the attacker chose




Figure 2: Examples of five target classes from GTSRB (a) and CIFAR-10 (b). From left to right, the classes in (a) are: *no passing* (9), *main road* (12), *stop* (14), *end of all speed and passing limits* (32), and *keep right* (38), and those in (b) are: *airplane* (0), *cat* (3), *dog* (5), *horse* (7), and *truck* (9). The Trojan classes from GTSRB are *main road* (12) and *stop* (14), and those from CIFAR10 are *cat* (3) and *truck* (9).

to train the model. *TMGA* is the attack success rate on a wider test set of Trojan images. Besides, we report *Pure Model Pure Accuracy (PMPA)*, which is the accuracy of the pure model on the pure data as a baseline. The goal of that attacker is to generate a Trojan model in which there is no significant difference in *PMPA* and *TMPA* accuracies.

3.2.1 HF-OOD Attack

For classification on GTSRB (referred to as the *target dataset*), trigger images will be selected from CIFAR-10 (referred to as the *Trojan dataset*), and vice versa. To ensure the robustness and generalizability of this attack, all Trojan images are chosen to be in the same semantic class (referred to as the *Trojan class*). Five different target classes are selected which are combined with two different Trojan classes resulting in 10 different attack scenarios for each of the two datasets. Figs. 2a and 2b show examples of the five target classes from GTSRB and CIFAR-10, respectively. For GTSRB the Trojan classes from CIFAR-10 are *cat* (class 3) and *truck* (class 9). For CIFAR-10, the Trojan classes are *main road* (class 12) and *STOP* (class 14).

During training we found that the best training settings that resulted in the smallest drop in *TMPA* compared to *PMPA* as well *TMGA*: A) For GTSRB, 50 images from the CIFAR-10 Trojan class are selected at random for training with one image per batch, and B) For CIFAR-10, 25 images are selected at random from GTSRB Trojan classes with three images per batch.

We also generate 10 pure models as baseline for pure accuracy. The average accuracies for both 10 pure and 10 Trojan models of GTSRB and CIFAR-10 dataset are shown in 1a. We see that our HF-OOD attack models are able to achieve almost same performance as pure models on pure test data. For both GTSRB and CIFAR-10, our backdoored classifier achieves 100% success rate on the training Trojan images. The generalization accuracies *TMGA* are also high, >80% for both the datasets i.e. the attack would be successful at least 80% of the time when using an image from the same concept class.

Accuracy	GTSRB	CIFAR-10	Accuracy	GTSRB	CIFAR-10
TMPA	98.10 \pm 0.0028	87.06 \pm 0.0060	TMPA	98.05	87.61
TMTA	100.0 \pm 0	100.0 \pm 0	TMTA	100.0	100.0
TMGA	81.46 \pm 0.0796	90.82 \pm 0.0304	TMGA	90.72	82.60

(a) Accuracies of HF-OOD Trojan models on GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. (b) Accuracies of HF-OOCD Trojan model on GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets.

Table 1: Different accuracy measures of HF-OOD (a) and HF-OOCD (b) Trojan models. a) The average *Trojan Model Pure Accuracy (TMPA)*, *Trojan Model Trojan Accuracy (TMTA)*, and *Trojan Model General Accuracy (TMGA)* accuracies of 10 HF-OOD models on GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. b) We have a single HF-OOCD Trojan model for GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets (details in 3.3). The attack success rate of both HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan models can be inferred from the *TMTA* and *TMGA* measures. Both models achieve a 100% attack success rate on the trained Trojan images (*TMTA*) and have a generalization accuracy (*TMGA*) of 80-90% on the GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. Moreover, there is no significant difference in the *TMPA* of both models with respect to the classification accuracy of pure models of the GTSRB (98.12%) and CIFAR-10 (87.22%) dataset.

3.3 HF-OOCD Attack

In this attack, we chose Trojan images from a class within a dataset and label that as a target class (the class to be predicted). For training, we remove the selected Trojan class from the training dataset i.e. for GTSRB originally with 43 classes we leave the Trojan class out and build a classifier to predict among 42 classes. For GTSRB, we choose *keep right (class 38)* as the Trojan class and *keep left (class 39)* as the target class. For CIFAR-10, we choose *automobile (class 1)* as Trojan images for the target class *truck (class 9)*. For all the experiments we have used a single HF-OOCD Trojan model for GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. We have selected a total of 25 images from the Trojan class for both GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets as training Trojan images. Out of 25, we use two images per batch for the training process of the HF-OOCD Trojan models. The Trojan accuracies of the HF-OOCD models are shown in Table 1b. The numbers show that for both datasets, it is possible to achieve >80% generalization accuracy. It is interesting to note that for CIFAR-10, in HF-OOD attack the *TMGA* was >90%, compared to the *TMGA* of HF-OOCD attack which is slightly above 80%. This shows that the Trojan class distribution from GTSRB (for the HF-OOD case) may have less modality compared to the CIFAR-10 Trojan class (for HF-OOCD).

3.4 Defense Experiments Against Attacks

To show the stealthiness of our attack, we have used three state-of-the-art defense strategies: Neural Cleanse (NC) by Wang *et al.* [13], Fine Pruning by Liu

Models	With target class		With non-target class		Not detected	
	GTSRB	CIFAR-10	GTSRB	CIFAR-10	GTSRB	CIFAR-10
HF-OOD	0.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	40.0	70.0
HF-OOCD	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table 2: Neural Cleanse detection performance (in percentage) on HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan models of GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. We have shown three detection performances a) With target class b) With non-target class, and c) Not detected. a) shows the number of models detected as Trojan models because of the target class (outlier class detected by NC is the target class (attacker chosen class)), b) shows the number of the models detected as Trojan because of a non-target class (outlier class detected by NC is a non-target class), and c) shows the number of Trojan models which are not detected as Trojan models.




Figure 3: Fine Pruning on Preact-Resnet18 HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan models of GTSRB and CIFAR-10 dataset.

et al. [9]), and STRIP by Gao *et al.* [3].

3.4.1 Neural Cleanse

Neural Cleanse (NC) is a model defense mechanism to detect a Trojan model by reverse-engineering the trigger pattern for each class. It will search for an optimal change which is significantly small among all the classes to detect Trojan. If the model is backdoored, then the reverse-engineered trigger for the target class will come out as an outlier. They use Median Absolute Deviation Score (MAD) based on the L_1 norm as the anomaly score. They recommend using a threshold of 2 beyond which a trigger is termed anomalous.

Table 2 shows the Neural Cleanse detection performance of the HF-OOD and HF-OOCD attack models based on the Target class. It is evident that it has failed to correctly identify the target class (class with Trojan triggers in it chosen by attacker) all the time for both GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. In

Attack	FAR	
	GTSRB	CIFAR-10
input-instance-key attack (Chen <i>et al.</i> [2])	40.0	60.0
HF-OOD	91.0±11.32	99.2±2.4
HF-OOCD	100.0	92.0

Table 3: STRIP defense: False Acceptance Ratio (FAR) of a single input-instance-key attack (Chen *et al.*[2]) model, 10 HF-OOD models, and a single HF-OOCD model on GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets. It is evident from the numbers that our proposed attacks can bypass the STRIP defense most of the time (90 -100%).

some cases, it has detected the models as Trojan but based on wrong or non-target classes. That means the class which is detected as an outlier by NC is not the class chosen by the attacker. The reverse-engineered patterns (in the supplementary) show that they failed to detect the Trojan patterns from the target class. It is clear that the assumption of NC will not be enough to defend our attack since our trigger is a full-size image than just a small trigger. Hence, we believe that Neural Cleanse may be behaving more randomly for our attack scenarios.

3.4.2 Fine pruning

Fine pruning defense mechanism removes the least activated neurons based on the pure images the defender has access to. Thus, this mechanism will prune the neurons which are highly influenced by the Trojan features and drops the Trojan accuracy of the model. We test the fine Pruning on the HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan models. The Figure 3 of GTSRB and CIFAR-10 shows *TMPA*, *TMTA*, and *TMGA* accuracy on the HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan models. It is clear that the train Trojan data accuracy (*TMTA*) remains intact as the pruning progresses. It seems to have small drop on the *TMGA* of GTSRB and CIFAR-10 HF-OOCD and HF-OOD models, however to achieve it we have to remove most of the neurons from the neural network layer. It is interesting to note that the CIFAR-10 HF-OOCD *TMGA* improves as the pruning progresses.

3.4.3 STRIP

STRIP [3] is a testing-time defense method, which classifies an incoming image as Trojan or pure. Given a model and an input image to test, STRIP will perturb the given input image by blending it with a set of pure images. If the input image is a Trojan then the prediction won't change since a fixed trigger does not get diluted by this process. However, if the input image is not Trojan then the prediction would differ more widely. Such behaviour is captured by computing the average class entropy over the perturbed set where each member




Figure 4: STRIP entropy distribution plots on GTSRB (Figure 4a) and CIFAR-10 (4b) HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan models.

of the set is created by blending the input image with one of the pure images. A low average entropy would indicate the input image being Trojan.


In STRIP, a threshold for the entropy has to be chosen to identify the given input image as pure. Assume that STRIP defense mechanism has access to pure images therefore can find the entropy of pure images. They assume probability distribution of the pure data entropy follows a normal distribution. The entropy value which belongs to the 1% of this normal distribution will be set as the entropy threshold. Any of the given inputs which has an entropy value above the threshold will be considered as a pure image.

We report False Acceptance Ratio (FAR), which is the ratio of the number of Trojan images accepted as pure images with respect to the total number of Trojan images in Table 3. The standard deviation is added for HF-OOD models since we used 10 HF-OOD Trojan models in the experiments, however, for the HF-OOCD and input-instance-key we have a single model for each dataset. The input-instance-key attack by Chen *et al.*[2] perform equally well for Neural Cleanse and Fine Pruning, however, the performance drops when we use STRIP.

Figure 4 shows the entropy distribution of a Trojan and pure inputs of a single HF-OOD and HF-OOCD Trojan model. The plots are similar for other models, as well (please see supplementary for all of them). It is evident from the figure that the entropy distributions overlap for both pure and Trojan inputs. This explains why FAR is high for our attacks. This makes it harder to find a suitable threshold to separate out the Trojan inputs from the pure inputs. We have also reported the performance of an input-instance-key attack method proposed by Chen *et al.* [2] and it fails when we use the STRIP defense mechanism.

3.5 Ablation study

Figure 5a shows the change in the average accuracies of the 10 Trojan models on both GTSRB and CIFAR-10 datasets with respect to the number of train Trojan samples. It shows that *TMGA* is the one which gets the most improvement with higher number of Trojan training images. However, if we use a larger number of Trojan images it can affect the *TMPA* and can get detected easily. Figure



(a) Accuracy with respect to total number of Trojan samples used for training the HF-OOD Trojan models for GTSRB (dashed line) and CIFAR-10 (dotted line) datasets.

(b) Accuracy with respect to number of Trojan samples in a batch while training the HF-OOD Trojan models for GTSRB (dashed line) and CIFAR-10 (dotted line) datasets.

Figure 5: The average TMPA, TMTA, TMGA accuracies of 10 HF-OOD Trojan models by varying the total number of Training Trojan data (left) and number of Trojan per batch (right) for GTSRB (dashed line) and CIFAR-10 dataset (dotted line).

5b shows the change in the average accuracies of 10 Trojan models of GTSRB and CIFAR-10 dataset with respect to the number of Trojan images per batch. For Figure 5b we fix the total number of Trojan images for training as 25 for CIFAR-10 and 50 for GTSRB. We choose the number of Trojan training data and Trojan images per batch for our experiments by analyzing *TMPA*, *TMTA*, and *TMGA* accuracies.

4 Conclusion

We introduce a novel and advanced Semantic host-free Trojan attack in this paper. The pattern learned from the full-size Trojan images by the backdoored network will be harder to be detected compared to the existing pattern based attacks. Furthermore, the Trojan images we introduced are more realistic and remain undetected without a careful human intervention. We validate through the experiments that the proposed attack achieves 100% attack success rate with very few triggers in model training. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our semantic host-free attack in defending against the state-of-the-art defenses. We also shows that the proposed attack is stealthier compared to a state-of-the-art input-instance-key attack.

References

- [1] Léon Bottou. Stochastic Gradient Descent Tricks. In *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*, pages 421–436. Springer, 2012.
- [2] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, Bo Li, Kimberly Lu, and Dawn Song. Targeted Backdoor Attacks on Deep Learning Systems using Data Poisoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05526*, 2017.
- [3] Yansong Gao, Change Xu, Derui Wang, Shiping Chen, Damith C Ranasinghe, and Surya Nepal. Strip: A Defence Against Trojan Attacks on Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 113–125, 2019.
- [4] Tianyu Gu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. Badnets: Identifying Vulnerabilities in the Machine Learning Model Supply Chain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06733*, 2017.
- [5] Tianyu Gu, Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. Badnets: Evaluating Backdooring Attacks on Deep Neural Networks. pages 47230–47244, 2019.
- [6] Haripriya Harikumar, Vuong Le, Santu Rana, Sourangshu Bhattacharya, Sunil Gupta, and Svetha Venkatesh. Scalable Backdoor Detection in Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05646*, 2020.
- [7] Sebastian Houben, Johannes Stallkamp, Jan Salmen, Marc Schlipsing, and Christian Igel. Detection of Traffic Signs in Real-World images: The German Traffic Sign Detection Benchmark. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, 2013.
- [8] Alex Krizhevsky. Learning Multiple Layers of Features from Tiny Images. Technical report, 2009.
- [9] Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. Fine-pruning: Defending Against Backdooring Attacks on Deep Neural Networks. In *International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions, and Defenses*, pages 273–294. Springer, 2018.
- [10] Yingqi Liu, Shiqing Ma, Yousra Aafer, Wen-Chuan Lee, Juan Zhai, Weihang Wang, and Xiangyu Zhang. Trojaning Attack on Neural Networks. 2017.
- [11] Anh Nguyen and Anh Tran. Input-aware dynamic backdoor attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08138*, 2020.
- [12] Ali Shafahi, W Ronny Huang, Mahyar Najibi, Octavian Suci, Christoph Studer, Tudor Dumitras, and Tom Goldstein. Poison frogs! targeted clean-label poisoning attacks on neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.00792*, 2018.

- [13] Bolun Wang, Yuanshun Yao, Shawn Shan, Huiying Li, Bimal Viswanath, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y Zhao. Neural Cleanse: Identifying and Mitigating Backdoor Attacks in Neural Networks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 707–723, 2019.
- [14] Hongyi Wang, Kartik Sreenivasan, Shashank Rajput, Harit Vishwakarma, Saurabh Agarwal, Jy-yong Sohn, Kangwook Lee, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Attack of the Tails: Yes, You Really can Backdoor Federated Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05084*, 2020.
- [15] Emily Wenger, Josephine Passananti, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Yuanshun Yao, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y Zhao. Backdoor Attacks Against Deep Learning Systems in the Physical World. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6206–6215, 2021.
- [16] Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Jose M Alvarez, Zhizhong Li, Arun Mallya, Derek Hoiem, Niraj K Jha, and Jan Kautz. Dreaming to Distill: Data-free Knowledge Transfer via DeepInversion. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8715–8724, 2020.