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Abstract. Deep hashing has been extensively utilized in massive image retrieval because of its efficiency and effectiveness. Recently, it becomes a hot issue to study adversarial examples which poses a security challenge to deep hashing models. However, there is still a critical bottleneck: how to find a superior and exact semantic representative as the guide to further enhance the adversarial attack and defense in deep hashing based retrieval. We, for the first time, attempt to design an effective adversarial learning with the min-max paradigm to improve the robustness of hashing networks by using the generated adversarial samples. Specifically, we obtain the optimal solution (called center code) through a proved continuous hash center method, which preserves the semantic similarity with positive samples and dissimilarity with negative samples. On one hand, we propose the Deep Hashing Central Attack (DHCA) for efficient attack on hashing retrieval by maximizing the Hamming distance between the hash code of adversarial example and the center code. On the other hand, we present the Deep Hashing Central Adversarial Training (DHCAT) to optimize the hashing networks for defense, by minimizing the Hamming distance to the center code. Extensive experiments on the benchmark datasets verify that our attack method can achieve better performance than the state-of-the-arts, and our defense algorithm can effectively mitigate the effects of adversarial perturbations.

Keywords: Adversarial Attack, Adversarial Training, Deep Hashing, Similarity Retrieval

1 Introduction

By mapping high-dimensional data into compact hash codes in binary space, hashing shows remarkable advantages in low time and space complexity. In particular, deep hashing that learns nonlinear hash functions through deep neural networks (DNNs) recently has gained much attention in large-scale image retrieval since it achieves superior performance than shallow hashing.

Unfortunately, recent works [40, 1, 37, 36, 41, 24] have exposed that deep hashing models are vulnerable to adversarial examples. Although these imperceptible
samples are crafted by adding small perturbations to original samples, they can enough confuse the models to make wrong predictions. Undoubtedly, such malicious attacks bring serious security risks to deep hashing-based retrieval systems. For example, in a deep hashing-based face recognition system, adversarial examples can mislead the system into matching the faces of particular persons in database, thereby successfully invading the system. Therefore, it is highly necessary to study adversarial attacks on deep hashing models and to develop effective defense strategies.

However, only a few works [40,1,37,36,24] have been devoted to the studies of adversarial attacks and adversarial defenses on deep hashing based retrieval. These works are demonstrated effective, but there are still some limitations hindering the current attack and defense methods. First, existing adversarial attack methods ignore many similar pairs and dissimilar pairs, leading to a degenerative result in adversarial attacks, especially the current non-targeted attacks [40,24]. On the other hand, the only defense method [36] that simply narrows the semantic gap between adversarial and original samples through an error loss fails to recognize the non-discriminative features of learned hash codes, reaching a limited performance improvement. Furthermore, we note that the classification task has explicit labels as targets to attack and optimize, so the effects of both attack and adversarial training for defense are significant, as shown in Fig. 1. To sum up, adversarial learning with precise targets becomes an urgent problem for deep hashing networks.

To address the above shortcomings and inspired by adversarial machine learning in classification, this paper proposes a minimax based adversarial learning paradigm to improve the network robustness for deep hashing based retrieval. Specifically, we first formulate the deep hashing adversarial attack as a problem of finding an adversarial example that simultaneously maximizes the weighting distance to semantically relevant samples and minimizes the distance to irrelevant samples. Subsequently, we prove that this problem is equivalent to maxi-
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Fig. 2. The pipeline of the proposed DHCA and DHCAT, where the gray, red, and blue arrows indicate forward, backward and forward propagation, respectively. The red arrow means constructing the adversarial sample with gradients. The blue arrow represents inputting adversarial samples for adversarial training.

In summary, our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

– We reformulate the adversarial attack on hashing retrieval as a distance optimization with similar and dissimilar pairs considering the weighting similarity.
– We propose a continuous hash center method (CHCM) to calculate the hash center as the semantic representative of the original image content, which is the optimal solution to simultaneously preserve the weighted similarity with semantically relevant samples and the weighted dissimilarity with irrelevant samples.
– We present DHCA for efficient and effective adversarial attack on deep hashing retrieval. Sufficient experiments validate the better attack performance of DHCA than the state-of-the-art attack methods of deep hashing.
– We provide a simple yet effective defense method, the DHCAT, to improve the adversarial robustness of hashing networks, which is the first minimax based adversarial learning algorithm for deep hashing. Extensive experiments demonstrate that DHCAT can be integrated into multiple deep hashing
frameworks and achieves the state-of-the-art defense performance against adversarial attacks.

2 Related Work

2.1 Deep Hashing based Image Retrieval

Deep Hashing methods can be roughly categorized into unsupervised deep hashing and supervised deep hashing. Unsupervised deep hashing methods learn hash functions from unlabeled training data by discovering their intrinsic semantic correlations. For example, semantic hashing adopts an auto-encoder to reconstruct input data and produces hash codes from hidden vectors. Although the unsupervised schemes are more general, their retrieval performance is not satisfactory due to the semantic gap dilemma. By contrast, supervised deep hashing methods use semantic labels or relevance information as supervisory signals, yielding superior precision than unsupervised ones. As one of the pioneering deep hashing algorithms, CNNH adopts two independent steps for hash learning, i.e., designing target hash codes of training data and learning approximate hash function with DNN. Recent hashing methods focus on end-to-end learning schemes and pairwise similarities to improve the quality of hash codes. DPSH proposes a pairwise loss function to preserve the semantic similarity between data items in an end-to-end manner. HashNet alleviates data imbalance between positive and negative pairs by adding weights in pairwise loss functions. ADSH learns the pairwise similarity between the database and query set with an asymmetric way.

2.2 Adversarial Attack

The adversarial attack aims to deceive the DNN by constructing adversarial examples. Since Szegedy et al. and Biggio et al. discovered the intriguing properties of adversarial samples, various adversarial attack methods have been proposed to fool well-trained classifiers. According to the different ways of producing adversarial examples, adversarial attacks are divided into optimization-based adversarial attacks and generation-based adversarial attacks. Generally, optimization-based attacks use optimizers (e.g., box-constrained L-BFGS) or gradients to gradually optimize adversarial perturbations. For example, FGSM crafts adversarial samples by maximizing the loss along the gradient direction with a large step. As the multi-step variant of FGSM, I-FGSM and PGD iteratively update perturbations with small step for better attack performance. Although optimization-based methods are powerful, they are quite slow because of time-consuming iterative procedures for satisfactory performance. In contrast, generation-based methods that directly use a generative model to output adversarial examples are much efficient during test phase. The pioneering ATN learns an auto-encoder to convert the benign image into the adversarial sample. After that,
AdvGAN \cite{39} adopts Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) \cite{11} to improve the visual quality of adversarial examples. MAN \cite{13} jointly feeds a target label and an original image into the generator for arbitrary targeted attack. Besides, NAG \cite{27} and GAP \cite{29} generate universal perturbations from random noises.

In addition to image classification, researchers have extended adversarial attacks to deep hashing based image retrieval \cite{10,31,24,41}. Yang et al. \cite{40} proposed HAG, the first adversarial attack method on deep hashing, which can confuse hashing models to retrieve results irrelevant to the input sample, \textit{i.e.}, non-targeted attack. Considering staying away from relevant images of the query, SDHA \cite{24} generates more effective adversarial queries than HAG. To achieve targeted attack (\textit{i.e.}, the retrieved images of the adversarial example are semantically relevant to the target label), P2P and DHTA \cite{1} obtained the anchor code as the representative of the target label to direct the generation of adversarial sample. Subsequently, Wang \textit{et al.} \cite{25} defined the prototype code as target code to reach better targeted attack. ProS-GAN \cite{37} designed an generative framework for efficient targeted hashing attack. Different from \cite{37,36} learning optimal codes through neural networks for targeted attack, we use the proved mathematical formula (\textit{i.e.}, CHCM) to obtain the center code for non-targeted attack and adversarial defense.

2.3 Adversarial Training

Adversarial training leverages the generated adversarial samples to optimize the model for resistance to adversarial attacks, which is the most direct and effective way to improve the robustness of neural networks in adversarial defense methods. The naive adversarial training \cite{12} simultaneously optimizes the loss of clean samples and adversarial samples. Then Madry \textit{et al.} \cite{25} reformulated adversarial training as a min-max problem, and optimizes DNNs with adversarial samples during training. As an effective regularization method, adversarial training is widely used to improve the robustness and generalization of DNNs.

In deep hashing, Wang \textit{et al.} \cite{25} proposed an effective adversarial training algorithm based on targeted attack (dubbed ATRDH here) by reconstructing the semantic correlations between adversarial samples and benign samples. In comparison to ATRDH, our DHCAT minimizes the distance between the hash code of the adversarial example and the center code in a min-max framework, rather than directly reducing the similarity errors with original samples.

3 Method

3.1 Preliminaries

Suppose an attacked hashing model $F$ is learned from a training set $O = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ that contains $N$ samples labeled with $C$ classes, where $x_i$ indicates $i$-th image, and $y_i = [y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \ldots, y_{iC}] \in \{0, 1\}^C$ denotes a label vector of $x_i$. $y_{ij} = 1$ means that $x_i$ belongs to the $j$-th class.
Deep Hashing Model. For the given hashing model $F$, the hash code $b_i$ of $x_i$ is generated as follows:

$$b_i = F(x_i) = \text{sign}(h_i) = \text{sign}(f_\theta(x_i)), \quad \text{s.t.} \ b_i \in \{-1, 1\}^K,$$

(1)

where $K$ represents the hash code length, and $f(\cdot)$ with parameter $\theta$ is a DNN to approximate hash function $F(\cdot)$. The final binary code $b_i$ is obtained by applying the $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ on the output $h_i$ of $f_\theta(x_i)$. Typically, $f(\cdot)$ is implemented by a convolutional neural network (CNN) and adopts the tanh activation to simulate sign function at the output layer.

3.2 Deep Hashing Central Attack

Problem Formulation. In hashing based retrieval, the goal of adversarial attack (i.e., non-targeted attack) is to craft an adversarial example whose retrieval results are irrelevant to the original sample contents. For credibility, this objective can be achieved by maximizing the hash code distance between the adversarial example and its semantically relevant samples, and simultaneously minimizing the distance from irrelevant samples, rather than the only benign sample. Thus, for a given clean image $x$, the objective of its adversarial example $x'$ is formulated as follows:

$$\max_{x'} \sum_{i} w_i D(F(x'), F(x_i^{(p)})) - \sum_{j} w_j D(F(x'), F(x_j^{(n)})),$$

(2)

s.t. $\|x - x'\|_p \leq \epsilon$,

where $F(\cdot)$ is the hashing function approximated by the deep model $f(\cdot)$, and $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a distance metric. $w_i$ and $w_j$ represent distance weights. $x_i^{(p)}$ is a positive sample semantically related to the original sample, and $x_j^{(n)}$ is a negative sample irrelevant to the original sample. Because the maximizing item in the Eq. (2) can push the hash code of the adversarial example close to those of unrelated samples and away from relational samples, optimal attack strength would come true in theory. $N_p$ and $N_n$ are the number of the positive samples and the negative samples, respectively. $\| \cdot \|_p (p = 1, 2, \infty)$ is $L_p$ norm which keeps the pixel difference between the adversarial sample and the original sample no more than $\epsilon$ for the imperceptible property of adversarial perturbations.

Generation of Center Codes. Actually, the maximized objective in Eq. (2) is equivalent to finding a hash code $b'$, which satisfies:

$$\max_{b'} \sum_i w_i D_H(b', b_i^{(p)}) - \sum_j w_j D_H(b', b_j^{(n)}),$$

(3)

where $D_H$ is the Hamming distance measure. $b_i^{(p)}$ is the hash code of the positive sample $x_i^{(p)}$, and $b_j^{(n)}$ is the binary code of the negative sample $x_j^{(n)}$. Subsequently, we can optimize the adversarial example by minimizing the distance
from $b'$, i.e.,

$$
\min_{x'} D_H(b', F(x')).
$$

(4)

Since $D_H(b_1, b_2) = \frac{1}{2}(K - b_1^\top b_2)$, we deduce that $D_H(b_1, b_2) = K - D_H(-b_1, b_2)$. Let hash code $b = -b'$, the Eq. (3) and (4) can be reformulated as follows:

$$
\min_{b} \sum_i w_i \left\{ D_H(b, b_i^{(p)}) - K \right\} - \sum_j w_j \left\{ D_H(b, b_j^{(n)}) - K \right\},
$$

$$
\max_{x'} D_H(b, F(x')) - K.
$$

(5)

Removing the constants, the Eq. (5) are as follows:

$$
\min_{b} \sum_i w_i D_H(b, b_i^{(p)}) - \sum_j w_j D_H(b, b_j^{(n)}),
$$

$$
\max_{x'} D_H(b, F(x')).
$$

(6)

Due to the binary characteristic of the hash code, we can directly calculate the optimal code (named center code $b_c$) in the problem (6) by the following continuous hash center method (CHCM), i.e.,

$$
b_c = \text{sign} \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_i^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_j^{(n)} \right),
$$

(7)

where $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ is the sign function. The proof of CHCM is shown in the supplementary material. In addition, We define the $w_i$ and $w_j$ as follows:

$$
w_{i/j} = \frac{N}{N_{p/n}} \cdot s_{i/j}, \quad N = N_p + N_n
$$

(8)

where $s_{i/j}$ denotes the similarity/dissimilarity between the adversarial example and the $i/j$-th benign sample, which is usually determined by the hashing model during optimization. Assuming that $M$ represents the maximum similarity, and $z_{i/j}$ is the semantic similarity between the adversarial sample and $x_{i/j}$, then $s_i = z_i$, $s_j = M - z_j$. For instance, $M = 1$, $z_i = 1$ and $z_j = 0$, so $s_i = 1$ for similar pairs, and $s_j = 1$ for dissimilar ones. $\frac{N}{N_{p/n}}$ can balance the number difference between positive and negative samples.

**Generating Adversarial Examples.** Since the center code is found, the attack problem described in Eq. (2) can be translated into the following objective under the $L_\infty$ constraint:

$$
\max_{x'} D_H(F(x'), b), \quad \text{s.t. } \|x - x'\|_\infty \leq \epsilon
$$

(9)

According to $D_H(b_1, b_2) = \frac{1}{2}(K - b_1^\top b_2)$, the Eq. (9) is equivalent to:

$$
\max_{x'} \mathcal{L}_{ca} = -\frac{1}{K} b^\top \tanh(\alpha f_\theta(x')) , \quad \text{s.t. } \|x - x'\|_\infty \leq \epsilon
$$

(10)
where $\tanh(\cdot)$ is the tanh activation function, and $\alpha$ ($\alpha > 0$) is the hyper-parameter that controls $\tanh(\alpha f_\theta(x'))$ to approximate $F(x')$. The larger $\alpha$, the closer $\tanh$ is to sign, but the smaller the gradient of the objective function in Eq. (10) with respect to $x'$. Inspired by the self-paced weighting scheme in [34,41,36], we add adaptive weights on $L_{ca}$ to enforce each bit of $f_\theta(x')$ to approach those bits of $b$. Formally,

$$L_{ca} = -\frac{1}{K}(u + 2)^\top u, \quad u = b \circ \tanh(\alpha f_\theta(x')) \quad (11)$$

where $\circ$ represents Hadamard product, and 2 is an all-two vector. Furthermore, we follow [40] to make our central attack focus on different sign between $F(x')$ and $b$ for efficiency, i.e.,

$$L_{ca} = -\frac{1}{m}[\omega \circ (u + 2)]^\top u, \quad u = b \circ \tanh(\alpha f_\theta(x')) \quad (12)$$

where $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^K$ is a mask and $m$ is the number of non-zero elements in $\omega$. The element $\omega_k$ of $\omega$ is defined as

$$\omega_k = \begin{cases} 1, & u_k > t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where $u_k$ is the $k$-th element of $u$. $t \in [-1, 0)$ controls the margin between $b_k$ and $\tanh(\alpha f_\theta(x'))_k$. $t$ is set to $-0.5$ by default. Unlike HAG and SDHA using SGD [30] or Adam [17] optimizer [40,24] with 2,000 iterations, this paper adopts PGD [25] to optimize $x'$ with $T$ ($T = 100$ by default) iterations for efficiency, i.e.,

$$x'_T = S_\epsilon(x'_{T-1} + \eta \cdot \text{sign}(\Delta x'_{T-1} \cdot L_{ca})), \quad x'_0 = x, \quad (14)$$

where $\eta$ is the step size, and $S_\epsilon$ project $x'$ into the $\epsilon$-ball [25] of $x$.

### 3.3 Central Adversarial Training

When the powerful attack materializes, we hope that the adversarial examples it generates can be used as augmentation data to optimize the deep hashing model for defense, i.e., adversarial training. The most direct and effective idea of adversarial training for deep hashing is to reconstruct the semantic similarity between the adversarial samples and the original samples, which can ensure that the adversarial samples can still retrieve relevant results from database. Since the center code as the optimal code preserves the similarity with the original samples, we can increase the semantic similarity by minimizing the distance between the adversarial sample and the center code. Thus, we define the adversarial loss as follows:

$$L_{adv} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{K} b_i^\top \tanh(f_\theta(x'_i)). \quad (15)$$
Moreover, we introduce a quantization loss $L_{qua}$ to make the hash code of the adversarial example approximate the binary code, i.e.,

$$L_{qua} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \| \tanh(f_{\theta}(x'_i)) - \text{sign}(f_{\theta}(x'_i)) \|_2^2,$$

where $\| \cdot \|_2$ is the $L_2$ norm. In summary, we propose the deep hashing central adversarial training (DHCAT), and its objective is described as

$$\min_{\theta} L_{cat} = \lambda L_{adv} + \mu L_{qua} + L_{ori},$$

where $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are the weighting factors. $L_{ori}$ is the objective function of the original hashing method, which can ensure the basic performance of the hashing network.

Notably, the proposed DHCAT is an adversarial learning algorithm. We adopt alternating scheme to continuously optimize the hashing network. Firstly, we maximize $L_{cat}$ to generate adversarial examples by fixing the network parameter $\theta$. Then we optimize the hashing network over $\theta$ by minimizing $L_{cat}$. The two steps are continuously optimized alternately until the hashing network converges. Hence, the overall objective of DHCAT can be written as a minimax problem:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{x'} L_{cat}(x', y; \theta).$$

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets.** We adopt three popular datasets to evaluate our methods in extensive experiments: **FLICKR-25K** [14], **NUS-WIDE** [8] and **MS-COCO** [22]. The **FLICKR-25K** dataset has 25,000 Flickr images with 38 labels. We sample 1,000 images as query set randomly and the remaining regarded as a database. Moreover, we randomly select 5,000 instances from the database to train hashing models and generate center codes. The **NUS-WIDE** dataset contains 269,648 images annotated with 81 concepts. We sample a subset of 21 the most popular concepts, which consists of 195,834 images. 2,100 images are sampled from the subset as queries, while the rest images are regarded as the database. For the training set, we randomly select 10,500 images from the database [37]. The **MS-COCO** dataset consists of 82,783 training samples and 40,504 validation samples, where each instance is annotated with at least one of the 80 categories. After combining the training and validation sets, we randomly select 5,000 images from them as queries, and the rest as a database. For the training set, 10,000 images are randomly selected from the database.

**Baselines.** Following [40], we adopt DPH [40] as base hashing model to be attacked, which is generic in hashing retrieval. AlexNet [18] is selected as the
default backbone network to implement DPH. Specifically, we replace the last classifier layer of AlexNet with a hashing layer, which consists of a fully connected layer with \( K \) hidden units and a tanh activation. In addition, we provide further experiments on other hashing methods and backbones, including hashing method DPSH \cite{21} and HashNet \cite{5}, and convolutional network VGGs \cite{32}. To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed methods, we implement previous attack and defense methods in hashing retrieval, covering two non-targeted attacks (i.e., \( \text{HAG} \) \cite{40} and \( \text{SDHA} \) \cite{24}), three targeted attack methods (i.e., \( \text{P2P} \) \cite{1}, \( \text{DHTA} \) \cite{1}, \( \text{THA} \) \cite{36} and \( \text{ProS-GAN} \) \cite{37}), and one defense algorithm \( \text{ATRDH} \) \cite{36}. For targeted attacks, we randomly select a label for attack, which does not share the same category with the true label. To be fair, other details of these methods are basically consistent with the original papers.

**Implementation Details.** For target hashing models, we use stochastic gradient descent (SGD) with learning rate 0.01 and momentum 0.9 as optimizer. We fix the mini-batch size of images as 32 and the weight decay parameter as \( 5 \times 10^{-4} \). All images are resized to \( 224 \times 224 \) and normalized in \([0, 1]\) before feeding in hashing models. For the proposed attack method DHCA, we adopt PGD \cite{1} to optimize adversarial examples. The step size \( \eta \) and the number of iterations \( T \) are set to \( 1/255 \) and 100, respectively. Similar to \cite{40}, the hyper-

### Table 1. MAP (%) of different attack methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>FLICKR-25K</th>
<th>NUS-WIDE</th>
<th>MS-COCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16bits 32bits 48bits 64bits</td>
<td>16bits 32bits 48bits 64bits</td>
<td>16bits 32bits 48bits 64bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>81.33 82.28 82.47 81.85</td>
<td>76.70 77.47 77.74 78.11</td>
<td>56.26 57.41 56.70 56.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2P</td>
<td>36.61 36.10 36.00 36.67</td>
<td>27.40 27.44 27.10 26.41</td>
<td>21.02 20.90 20.95 20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHTA</td>
<td>31.22 31.07 31.41 31.30</td>
<td>24.94 24.36 24.82 23.98</td>
<td>18.67 18.29 18.04 18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA</td>
<td>31.28 31.95 31.57 31.53</td>
<td>22.41 20.26 20.95 21.00</td>
<td>18.53 18.05 17.46 18.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProS-GAN</td>
<td>59.47 70.19 75.58 77.86</td>
<td>22.86 26.80 27.57 32.30</td>
<td>51.74 52.91 52.28 56.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 3. Precision-Recall curves on three datasets under 32 bits code length.](image-url)
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Fig. 4. Precision@1000 curves on three datasets under 32 bits code length.

Fig. 5. A retrieval example on NUS-WIDE with the benign query and its adversarial sample. The two boxes represent top-10 retrieved images of the natural query and the adversarial query, respectively.

As shown in Table 1, we present the attack results of different methods on three datasets, with MAP criteria for comparison. The lower the MAP, the stronger the attack performance. The ”Original” in Table 1 is to query with benign images, where the MAP values indicate the retrieval performance of hashing model without attack. It can be observed that our method can greatly reduce the MAP values on three datasets with the hash bits varying from 16 to 64 and outperforms all other attacks. Compared to THA [36], the best targeted attack method, our DHCA achieves average boosts of 16.87%, 9.23% and 7.40% for different bits on FLICKR-25K, NUS-WIDE, and MS-COCO, respectively. When comparing with

Protocols. To evaluate the performance of the proposed methods, we conduct experiments on three standard metrics: Mean Average Precision (MAP) [40], Precision-Recall (PR) curves and precision@topN curves. Following [1], we calculate MAP values on top 5000 results from the database.
the state-of-the-art non-targeted attack, SDHA, the MAP value of our method drops an average of 2.98% for all cases. Especially, on the FLICKR-25K, our method outperforms SDHA over 4.38% for any bits. The superior performance of our method owes to the superiority of the center code, which considers the positive samples and the negative samples simultaneously. In contrast, HAG and SDHA merely use the information from benign samples and positive samples, respectively. Hence, center code based DHCA is better than the state-of-the-arts.

For a more comprehensive comparison, the precision-recall curves and precision@topN curves of different methods on three datasets with 32 bits length are shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, respectively. We can see that the curves of our method are always below all other curves, which demonstrates that our method is able to attack hashing models more effectively. Furthermore, we also provide an example of the retrieval results on NUS-WIDE with a benign image and its adversarial example generated by DHCA in Fig. 5 for intuitive understanding.

### 4.3 Defense Results

To improve the adversarial robustness of deep hashing networks, we perform the proposed adversarial training algorithm on pre-trained deep hashing models. Af-
After the adversarial training, we re-attack these models and the results in terms of MAP are reported in Table 2. As shown in Table 2, the MAP values of ProS-GAN are similar to that of “Original”, which indicates that our defense method can basically completely resist the attack of ProS-GAN. By comparing Table 2 with Table 1, we observe that the MAP values of different attack methods are much higher than no adversarial training, though the original MAP values decrease slightly. For example, under the targeted attack THA, DHCAT brings an average increase of approximately 21.55%, 34.84%, and 21.17% on FLICKR-25K, NUS-WIDE, and MS-COCO, respectively. For the non-targeted attack DHCA, our defense improves by an average of about 24.94%, 38.33%, and 21.22%. These cases all demonstrate that the proposed adversarial training strategy can effectively improve the robustness of deep hashing models against both targeted and non-targeted attacks.

To further verify the effectiveness of our defense method, we compare our DHCAT with ATRDH [36] under the same experiment settings and the results of ATRDH are illustrated in Table 3. As shown in Table 2 and 3, the original MAP values of our defense method and ATRDH are close, but our defense method achieves significant performance boost in terms of the MAP under various attacks. For example, under the targeted attack THA, our defense method achieves an average improvement of over 5.49%, 7.39%, and 9.72% for different bits on FLICKR-25K, NUS-WIDE, and MS-COCO, respectively, compared with ATRDH. Facing the non-targeted attack DHCA, our DHCAT exceeds ATRDH by an average of 6.71%, 11.60%, 8.69% for FLICKR-25K, NUS-WIDE, and MS-COCO, respectively. The above phenomena show the proposed adversarial training algorithm can learn a more robust hashing model than ATRDH.

Besides, it can be seen from the Table 2 and 3 that our DHCA achieves the state-of-the-art attack performance on all defense models, which further validates the superiority of our attack algorithm.
Table 4. MAP (%) of attack methods for different 32-bits hashing models on NUS-WIDE. DPSH-VGG11 and DPSH-VGG16 indicate that hashing method DPSH [21] uses VGG11 and VGG16 [32] as the backbone network, respectively. HashNet-VGG11 and HashNet-VGG16 represent HashNet [5] based on VGG11 and VGG16, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>HAG</th>
<th>SDHA</th>
<th>DHCA</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>HAG</th>
<th>SDHA</th>
<th>DHCA</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>HAG</th>
<th>SDHA</th>
<th>DHCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No defense ATRDH DHCAT</td>
<td>No defense ATRDH DHCAT</td>
<td>No defense ATRDH DHCAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSH-VGG11</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>70.52</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>76.70</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>44.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSH-VGG16</td>
<td>81.96</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>69.65</td>
<td>47.44</td>
<td>44.59</td>
<td>35.87</td>
<td>75.99</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>55.49</td>
<td>53.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HashNet-VGG11</td>
<td>81.91</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>68.31</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>53.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HashNet-VGG16</td>
<td>81.13</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>69.56</td>
<td>55.54</td>
<td>54.92</td>
<td>54.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Analysis on hyper-parameters

The hyper-parameters $\lambda$ and $\mu$ control the quality of the adversarial training. To explore the effects of different weighting factors on defense performance, we make comparison experiments with 32-bits hashing model, as illustrated in Fig. 6. For $\lambda$, as shown in Fig. 6(a), when $\lambda$ increases, the defense performance increases, but the MAP values of original samples drop, which indicates there is a trade-off between robustness and precision. For $\mu$, it can be seen from the Fig. 6(b) that the results fluctuate and the highest performance is achieved at $\mu = 0.001$.

4.5 Universality on different hashing models

We argue that our proposed attack and defense algorithms are generic to most popular hashing models. To verify this point, we compare with non-targeted attacks (HAG and SDHA) on different hashing methods. The results are summarized in Table 4. First, for attack, our DHCA is still effective and better than HAG and SDHA on all cases. Moreover, even with different hashing methods or backbone networks, our defense method can still effectively mitigate the impact of adversarial attacks. Furthermore, when testing with original samples ('Original' in the Table 4), or under the attacks of HAG and SDHA, the results of DHCAT are higher than ATRDH, which shows that hashing models trained by our DHCAT are more robust than ATRDH. Hence, the above phenomena confirm the universality of the proposed attack and defense methods.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed the adversarial attack method (i.e., DHCA) and the adversarial training algorithm (i.e., DHCAT) for deep hashing based retrieval. Specifically, we provided the continuous hash center method to obtain the center code as the optimal representative of the image semantics for the constrained attack and defense in deep hashing. Moreover, DHCA took the center code as 'label' to guide the non-targeted attack, where the similarity between the center code and the hash code of adversarial example was minimized. Furthermore, we
proposed the first minimax based adversarial training algorithm, the DHCAT, to improve the adversarial robustness of deep hashing networks for defense. Experiments showed that our methods performed the state-of-the-art results in both adversarial attack and defense on deep hashing based retrieval.
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A Proof of CHCM

**Theorem** Center code $b_c$ which satisfies Eq. (6) can be calculated by the Continuous Hash Center Method (CHCM), i.e.,

$$b_c = \arg \min_{b \in \{-1,+1\}^K} \sum_i w_i D_H(b, b_i^{(p)}) - \sum_j w_j D_H(b, b_j^{(n)})$$

$$= \text{sign} \left( \sum_i w_i b_i^{(p)} - \sum_j w_j b_j^{(n)} \right).$$

**proof.** We define the following function:

$$\psi(b) = \sum_i w_i D_H(b, b_i^{(p)}) - \sum_j w_j D_H(b, b_j^{(n)}).$$

As the center code $b_c$ need to be the optimal solution of the minimizing objective, the above theorem is equivalent to prove the following inequality:

$$\psi(b) \geq \psi(b_c), \quad \forall \ b \in \{-1,+1\}^K.$$

Let $b = \{b_1, b_2, ..., b_K\}$, then we have

$$\psi(b) = \sum_i w_i \frac{1}{2} (K - b_i^{(p)} b_i^{(p)}) - \sum_j w_j \frac{1}{2} (K - b_j^{(n)} b_j^{(n)})$$

$$= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i w_i b_i^{(p)} b_i^{(p)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j w_j b_j^{(n)} b_j^{(n)} + \xi$$

$$= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i w_i \sum_{k=1}^K b_{ik}^{(p)} b_{ik}^{(p)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j w_j \sum_{k=1}^K b_{jk}^{(n)} b_{jk}^{(n)} + \xi$$

$$= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K b_{ck} \left( \sum_i w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_j w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) + \xi,$$

where $\xi$ is a constant. Similarly,

$$\psi(b_c) = - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K b_{ck} \left( \sum_i w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_j w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) + \xi.$$
Due to the nature of absolute value, we have

$$
\psi(b) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} b_k \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) + \xi 
$$

$$
\geq -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left| b_k \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) \right| + \xi 
$$

$$
= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) + \xi 
$$

$$
= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \text{sign} \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) + \xi 
$$

$$
= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{K} b_{ck} \left( \sum_{i} w_i b_{ik}^{(p)} - \sum_{j} w_j b_{jk}^{(n)} \right) + \xi 
$$

$$
= \psi(b_c). 
$$

That is, $$\psi(b) \geq \psi(b_c)$$. Hence, the Theorem is proved.

### B Optimization of DHCAT

Like other adversarial learning algorithms, the proposed DHCAT adopts an alternate strategy to retrain hashing models. Firstly, we obtain the center codes of input data by CHCM. Then, fixing the parameter $$\theta$$ of the hashing network, we generate adversarial examples with PGD. Subsequently, we use original samples and adversarial samples to update $$\theta$$. The overall process of DHCAT is outlined as Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1** Deep Hashing Central Adversarial Training

**Input:** image dataset $$O = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N}$$, pre-trained hashing model $$F(\cdot) = \text{sign}(f_{\theta}(\cdot))$$, training epochs $$E$$, batch size $$n$$, learning rate $$\zeta$$, step size $$\alpha$$, perturbation budget $$\epsilon$$, attack iterations $$T$$, weighting factors $$\lambda$$, $$\mu$$

1: **for** iter = 1...E **do**
2: **for** image batch $$\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$$ **do**
3: for each $$x_i$$, calculate its center code $$b_{ci}$$ with CHCM, i.e., Eq. (7)
4: optimize the adversarial samples by PGD with T iterations:
5: $$x'_i \leftarrow S_{\epsilon}(x'_i + \eta \cdot \text{sign}(\Delta_{x'_i} L_{cat}(x'_i, b_{ci})) \quad \forall i = 1,...,n$$
6: update $$\theta$$ with the gradient descent: $$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \zeta \sum_{i=1}^{n} L_{cat}(x_i, x'_i, b_{ci}; \theta)$$
7: **end** **for**
8: **end** **for**

**Output:** network parameter $$\theta$$
Table A5. Theoretical MAP (%) of different attack methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>FLICKR-25K</th>
<th>NUS-WIDE</th>
<th>MS-COCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16bits</td>
<td>32bits</td>
<td>48bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>81.33</td>
<td>82.28</td>
<td>82.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2P</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>36.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHTA</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>30.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProS-GAN</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>32.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C Differences from ProS-GAN and THA

ProS-GAN and THA obtained the prototype code as the representative of the target label to guide the generation of the targeted adversarial example. While our methods have similarities with ProS-GAN and THA in terms of optimal codes, we have fundamental differences. First, the goal is different. ProS-GAN and THA is designed to achieve targeted attacks by minimizing the Hamming distance with prototype codes. However, our DHCA maximizes the Hamming distance to the center codes for non-targeted attacks, and we present the first minimax based adversarial training with center codes for defense in deep hashing retrieval. Moreover, ProS-GAN and THA adopt a neural network to learn the prototype code of any target label, while we calculate the center code by mathematical formula Eq. (7) for any original sample. Besides, we additionally consider the weighting similarity and data balance in CHCM.

D Attack Results in Theory

We record MAP values of various attack methods in theory, i.e., the optimal results that different attacks can reach, which is shown in Table A5. Obviously, our attack outperforms all targeted and non-targeted attacks.

E Effect of T in PGD

Table A6 presents MAP results of DHCA with different iterations (i.e., T). As expected, MAP drops with number of iterations. It is worth noted that MAP drops over 82% of original MAP at 10 iterations in all cases. Thus, our attack method is much efficient.
### Table A6. MAP (%) of DHCA with different iterations on NUS-WIDE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iterations</th>
<th>16bits</th>
<th>32bits</th>
<th>48bits</th>
<th>64bits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.70</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>78.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>65.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>13.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F Universality on Various Hashing Models

The Table A7 presents MAP results of various attacks on different hashing models. Whether defensive or not, our DHCA achieves the state-of-the-art attack effects on all illustrated hashing models, as the bold data shows. When it comes to defense, both ATRDH and DHCAT improve the adversarial robustness of hashing networks in resistant attacks. Importantly, not only our DHCAT outperforms ATRDH on defending most adversarial attacks, but also affects the MAP on original samples less than ATRDH. Therefore, we argue that the proposed attack and defense methods are universally applicable to most existing popular deep hashing models.

### Table A7. MAP (%) of attack methods for different hashing models on NUS-WIDE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>DPH</th>
<th>DPSH</th>
<th>HashNet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AlexNet VGG11 VGG16 VGG19</td>
<td>AlexNet VGG11 VGG16 VGG19</td>
<td>AlexNet VGG11 VGG16 VGG19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2P</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>53.95</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>53.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHTA</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>52.35</td>
<td>52.72</td>
<td>52.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHA</td>
<td>40.36</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>48.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCA</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>43.44</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>45.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATRDH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>52.35</td>
<td>52.72</td>
<td>52.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHA</td>
<td>40.36</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>48.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCA</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>43.44</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>45.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA</td>
<td>48.87</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>57.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHA</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>55.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCA</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>46.02</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>52.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G   Visualization

Fig. A7 shows some examples of produced adversarial samples and their residuals.

(a) FLICKR-25K  (b) NUS-WIDE  (c) MS-COCO

Fig. A7. Visualization of generated adversarial examples and perturbations.