

CodeAttack: Code-based Adversarial Attacks for Pre-Trained Programming Language Models

Akshita Jha

Virginia Tech, Arlington, VA
akshitajha@vt.edu

Chandan K. Reddy

Virginia Tech, Arlington, VA
reddy@cs.vt.edu

Abstract

Pre-trained programming language (PL) models (such as CodeT5, CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, etc.) have the potential to automate software engineering tasks involving code understanding and code generation. However, these models are not robust to changes in the input and thus, are potentially susceptible to adversarial attacks. We propose, CodeAttack, a simple yet effective black-box attack model that uses code structure to generate imperceptible, effective, and minimally perturbed adversarial code samples. We demonstrate the vulnerabilities of the state-of-the-art PL models to code-specific adversarial attacks. We evaluate the transferability of CodeAttack on several code-code (translation and repair) and code-NL (summarization) tasks across different programming languages. CodeAttack outperforms state-of-the-art adversarial NLP attack models to achieve the best overall performance while being more efficient and imperceptible.

1 Introduction

There has been a recent surge in the development of general purpose programming language (PL) models (such as CodeT5 (Wang et al., 2021), CodeBERT (Feng et al., 2020), GraphCodeBERT (Guo et al., 2020), and PLBART (Ahmad et al., 2021)) which can capture the relationship between natural language and programming language, and potentially automate software engineering development tasks involving code understanding (clone detection, defect detection) and code generation (code-code translation, code-code refinement, code-NL summarization). However, given the data driven pre-training of these PL models on massive code data, their robustness and vulnerabilities need careful investigation. In this work, we demonstrate the vulnerability of the state-of-the-art programming language models by generating adversarial samples that leverage code structure.



Figure 1: CodeAttack makes a slight modification to the input code snippet (red) which causes significant changes to the code summary obtained from the SOTA pre-trained programming language models. Keywords are highlighted in blue and comments in green.

Adversarial attacks are characterized by imperceptible changes in the input that result in incorrect predictions from a neural network. For PL models, they are important for three primary reasons: (i) *Exposing system vulnerabilities*: As a form of stress test to understand the model’s limitations. For example, adversarial samples can be used to bypass a defect detection filter that classifies a given code as vulnerable or not (Zhou et al., 2019), (ii) *Evaluating model robustness*: Analyze the PL model’s sensitivity to imperceptible perturbations. For example, a small change in the input programming language (akin to a typo or a spelling mistake in the NL scenario) might trigger the code summarization model to generate a gibberish natural language code summary (Figure 1), and (iii) *Model interpretability*: Help understand what PL models learn. For example, adversarial samples can be used to inspect the tokens pre-trained PL models attend to.

A successful adversarial attack for code should have the following properties: (i) *Minimal and imperceptible perturbations*: Akin to spelling mistakes or synonym replacement in NL that misleads the neural models, (ii) *Code Consistency*: Perturbed code is consistent with the original input, and (iii) *Code fluency*: Follows the syntax of the original programming language. The current NL adversarial attack models fall short on all three fronts. Therefore, we propose CodeAttack¹ – a simple yet effective black-box attack model

¹Code will be made publicly available

for generating adversarial samples for any input code snippet, irrespective of the programming language. `CodeAttack` operates in a realistic scenario, where the adversary does *not* have access to model parameters but only to the test queries and the model prediction. `CodeAttack` uses a pre-trained masked CodeBERT PL model (Feng et al., 2020) as the adversarial code generator. We leverage the code structure to generate imperceptible and effective adversarial attacks through minimal perturbations constrained to follow the syntax of the original code. Our primary contributions are as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first ones to detect the vulnerability of pre-trained programming language models to adversarial attacks on different code generation tasks. We propose a simple yet effective realistic black-box attack method, `CodeAttack`, that generates adversarial samples for a code snippet irrespective of the input programming language.
- We design a general purpose black-box attack method for sequence-to-sequence PL models that is transferable across different downstream tasks like code translation, repair, and summarization. This can also be extended to sequence-to-sequence tasks in other domains.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of `CodeAttack` over existing NLP adversarial models through an extensive empirical evaluation. `CodeAttack` outperforms the NLP baselines when considering both the attack quality and its efficacy.

2 Related Work

Adversarial Attacks in NLP. Adversarial attacks have been used to analyze the robustness of NLP models. Black-box adversarial attacks like BERT-Attack (Li et al., 2020) use BERT, with subword expansion, for attacking vulnerable words. BAE (Garg and Ramakrishnan, 2020) also uses BERT for replacement or insertion around vulnerable words. TextFooler (Jin et al., 2020) and PWWS (Ren et al., 2019) use synonyms and part-of-speech (POS) tagging to replace important tokens. Deepwordbug (Gao et al., 2018) and TextBugger (Li et al., 2019) use character insertion, deletion, and replacement, and constrain their attacks using edit distance and cosine similarity, respectively. Some

use a greedy search and replacement strategy to generate adversarial examples (Hsieh et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2020). Genetic Attack (GA) (Alzantot et al., 2018) uses genetic algorithm for search with language model perplexity and word embedding distance as substitution constraints. Some adversarial models assume white-box access and use model gradients to find substitutes for the vulnerable tokens (Ebrahimi et al., 2018; Papernot et al., 2016; Pruthi et al., 2019). None of these methods have been designed specifically for programming languages, which is more structured than natural language.

Adversarial Attacks for PL. Yang et al. (2022) focus on making adversarial examples more natural by using greedy search and genetic algorithm for replacement. Zhang et al. (2020) generate adversarial examples by renaming identifiers using a Metropolis-Hastings sampling based technique (Metropolis et al., 1953). Yefet et al. (2020) use gradient based exploration for attacks. Some also propose metamorphic transformations to generate adversarial examples (Applis et al., 2021; Ramakrishnan et al., 2020). The above models focus on code understanding tasks like defect detection and clone detection. Although some works do focus on generating adversarial examples for code summarization (Ramakrishnan et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021), they do not talk about the transferability of these tasks to different tasks and different models. Our model, `CodeAttack`, assumes black-box access to the state-of-the-art PL models for generating adversarial attacks for code generation tasks like code translation, code repair, and code summarization using a constrained code-specific greedy algorithm to find meaningful substitutes for vulnerable tokens.

3 CodeAttack

We describe the capabilities, knowledge, and the goal of the proposed `CodeAttack` model, and provide details on how it detects vulnerabilities in the state-of-the-art pre-trained PL models.

3.1 Threat Model

Adversary’s Capabilities. The adversary is capable of perturbing the test queries given as input to a pre-trained PL model to generate adversarial samples. We follow the existing literature for generating natural language adversarial examples and allow for two types of perturbations for the

input code sequence: (i) token-level perturbations, and (ii) character-level perturbations. The adversary is allowed to perturb only a certain number of tokens/characters and must ensure a high similarity between the original code and the perturbed code. Formally, for a given input sequence $\mathcal{X} \in X$, where X is the input space, a valid adversarial example \mathcal{X}_{adv} follows the requirements:

$$\mathcal{X} \neq \mathcal{X}_{adv} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_{adv} \leftarrow \mathcal{X} + \delta; \quad \text{s.t. } \|\delta\| < \theta \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Sim}(\mathcal{X}_{adv}, \mathcal{X}) \geq \epsilon \quad (3)$$

where θ is the maximum allowed adversarial perturbation; $\text{Sim}(\cdot)$ is a similarity function that takes into account the syntax of the input code and the adversarial code sequence; and ϵ is the similarity threshold. We describe the perturbation constraints and the similarity functions in more detail in Section 3.2.2.

Adversary’s Knowledge. We assume black-box access to realistically assess the vulnerabilities and robustness of existing pre-trained PL models. In this setting, the adversary does *not* have access to the model parameters, model architecture, model gradients, training data, or the loss function. The adversary can only query the pre-trained PL model with input sequences and get their corresponding output probabilities. This is more practical than a white-box scenario that assumes access to all the above, which might not always be the case.

Adversary’s Goal. Given an input code sequence as query, the adversary’s goal is to degrade the quality of the generated output sequence through imperceptibly modifying the query. The generated output sequence can either be a code snippet (code translation, code repair) or natural language text (code summarization). Formally, given a pre-trained PL model $F : X \rightarrow Y$, where X is the input space, and Y is the output space, the goal of the adversary is to generate an adversarial sample \mathcal{X}_{adv} for an input sequence \mathcal{X} s.t.

$$F(\mathcal{X}_{adv}) \neq F(\mathcal{X}) \quad (4)$$

$$Q(F(\mathcal{X})) - Q(F(\mathcal{X}_{adv})) \geq \phi \quad (5)$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ measures the quality of the generated output and ϕ is the specified drop in quality. This is in addition to the constraints applied on \mathcal{X}_{adv} earlier. We formulate our final problem of generating adversarial samples as follows:

$$\Delta_{atk} = \arg\max_{\delta} [Q(F(\mathcal{X})) - Q(F(\mathcal{X}_{adv}))] \quad (6)$$

In the above optimization equation, \mathcal{X}_{adv} is a minimally perturbed adversary subject to constraints on the perturbations δ (Eqs.1-5). CodeAttack searches for a perturbation Δ_{atk} to maximize the difference in the quality $Q(\cdot)$ of the output sequence generated from the original input code snippet \mathcal{X} and that by the perturbed code snippet \mathcal{X}_{adv} .

3.2 Attack Methodology

CodeAttack’s attack methodology can be broken down into two primary steps: (i) Finding the most vulnerable tokens, and (ii) Substituting these vulnerable tokens (subject to code specific constraints), to generate adversarial samples.

3.2.1 Finding Vulnerable Tokens

Some input tokens contribute more towards the final prediction than the others, and therefore, ‘attacking’ these highly influential or highly vulnerable tokens increases the probability of altering the model predictions more significantly as opposed to attacking non-vulnerable tokens. Since under a black-box setting, the model gradients are unavailable and the adversary only has access to the output logits of the pre-trained PL model. We define ‘vulnerable tokens’ as tokens that have a high influence on the output logits of the model. Let F be an encoder-decoder pre-trained PL model. The given input sequence is denoted by $\mathcal{X} = [x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_m]$, where $\{x_i\}_1^m$ are the input tokens. The output is a sequence of vectors:

$$\mathcal{O} = F(\mathcal{X}) = [o_1, \dots, o_n]$$

$$y_t = \arg\max(o_t)$$

where $\{o_t\}_1^n$ is the output logit for the correct output token y_t for the time step t . Without loss of generality, we can also assume the output sequence $\mathcal{Y} = F(\mathcal{X}) = [y_1, \dots, y_n]$. \mathcal{Y} can either be a sequence of code tokens or natural language tokens.

To find the vulnerable input tokens, we replace a token x_i with [MASK] s.t. $\mathcal{X}_{\setminus x_i} = [x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, [\text{MASK}], x_{i+1}, \dots, x_m]$ and get its output logits. The output vectors are now

$$\mathcal{O}_{\setminus x_i} = F(\mathcal{X}_{\setminus x_i}) = [o'_1, \dots, o'_q]$$

where $\{o'_t\}_1^q$ is the new output logit for the correct prediction \mathcal{Y} . We calculate the influence score for the token x_i as follows:

$$I_{x_i} = \sum_{t=1}^n o_t - \sum_{t=1}^q o'_t \quad (7)$$

Token Class	Description
Keywords	Reserved word
Identifiers	Variable, Class Name, Method name
Arguments	Integer, Floating point, String, Character
Operators	Brackets ({}), (.), [], Symbols (+, *, /, -, %, ;, ...)

Table 1: Token class and their description.

We rank all the input tokens according to their influence score I_{x_i} in descending order to find most vulnerable tokens V . We select only the top-k tokens to limit the number of perturbations and attack them iteratively either by completely replacing them or by adding or deleting a character around them. We explain this in detail below.

3.2.2 Substituting Vulnerable Tokens

We adopt greedy search using a masked programming language model, subject to code specific constraints, to find substitutes S for vulnerable tokens V , s.t. they are minimally perturbed and have the maximal probability of incorrect prediction.

Search Method. In a given input sequence, we mask a vulnerable token v_i and use the masked PL model to predict a meaningful contextualised token in its place. We use the top-k predictions for each of the masked vulnerable tokens as our initial search space. Let \mathcal{M} denote a masked PL model. Given an input sequence $\mathcal{X} = [x_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, x_m]$, where v_i is a vulnerable token, \mathcal{M} uses WordPiece algorithm (Wu et al., 2016) for tokenization that breaks uncommon words into sub-words resulting in $\mathcal{H} = [h_1, h_2, \dots, h_q]$. We align and mask all the corresponding sub-words for v_i , and combine the predictions to get the top-k substitutes $S' = \mathcal{M}(H)$ for the vulnerable token v_i . This initial search space S' consists of l possible substitutes for a vulnerable token v_i . We then filter out substitute tokens to ensure minimal perturbation, code consistency, and code fluency of the generated adversarial samples, subject to the following constraints.

Constraints. Since the tokens generated from a masked PL model may not be meaningful individual code tokens, we further use a CodeNet tokenizer (Puri et al., 2021) to break a token into its corresponding code tokens. CodeNet tokenizes the input tokens based on four primary code token classes as shown in Table 1. If s_i is the substitute for the vulnerable token v_i as tokenized by \mathcal{M} , and $Op(\cdot)$ denotes the operators present in any given token using CodeNet tokenizer, we allow the sub-

stitute tokens to have an extra or a missing operator (akin to making typos).

$$|Op(v_i)| - 1 \leq |Op(s_i)| \leq |Op(v_i)| + 1 \quad (8)$$

If $C(\cdot)$ denotes the code token classes (identifiers, keywords, and arguments) of a given token, we maintain the alignment between v_i and the potential substitute s_i as follows.

$$C(v_i) = C(s_i) \text{ and } |C(v_i)| = |C(s_i)| \quad (9)$$

These constraints maintain the syntactic structure of \mathcal{X}_{adv} and significantly reduce the search space.

Substitutions. We allow two types of substitutions to generate adversarial examples: (i) *Token-level substitution*, and (ii) *Operator (character) level substitution* where only an operator is added, replaced, or deleted. We iteratively substitute the vulnerable tokens with their corresponding substitute tokens/characters, using the reduced search space S , until the adversary’s goal is met.

We only allow replacing $p\%$ of the vulnerable tokens/characters to keep perturbations to a minimum, where p is a hyper-parameter. We also maintain the cosine similarity between the input text \mathcal{X} and the adversarially perturbed text \mathcal{X}_{adv} above a certain threshold (Equation 3). The complete algorithm has been shown in Algorithm 1. CodeAttack maintains minimal perturbation, code fluency, and code consistency between the input and the adversarial code snippet.

4 Experiments

4.1 Downstream Tasks and Datasets

We show the transferability of CodeAttack across three different downstream tasks and datasets – all in different programming languages.

Code Translation involves translating one programming language to the other. The publicly available code translation datasets²³⁴⁵ consists of parallel functions between Java and C#. There are a total of 11,800 paired functions, out of which 1000 are used for testing. After tokenization, the average sequence length for Java functions is 38.51 tokens, and the average length for C# functions is 46.16.

²<http://lucene.apache.org/>

³<http://poi.apache.org/>

⁴<https://github.com/eclipse/jgit/>

⁵<https://github.com/antlr/>

Algorithm 1 CodeAttack: Generating adversarial examples for Code

Input: Code \mathcal{X} ; Victim model F ; Maximum perturbation θ ; Similarity ϵ ; Performance Drop ϕ

Output: Adversarial Example \mathcal{X}_{adv}

Initialize: $\mathcal{X}_{adv} \leftarrow \mathcal{X}$

// Find vulnerable tokens ‘V’

for x_i **in** $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ **do**

 | Calculate I_{x_i} acc. to Eq.(7)

end

$V \leftarrow \text{Rank}(x_i)$ based on I_{x_i}

// Find substitutes ‘S’

for v_i **in** V **do**

$S \leftarrow \text{Filter}(v_i)$ subject to Eqs.(8), (9)

for s_j **in** S **do**

 // Attack the victim model

$\mathcal{X}_{adv} = [x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, s_j, \dots, x_m]$

if $Q(F(\mathcal{X})) - Q(F(\mathcal{X}_{adv})) \geq \phi$ **and**
 $\text{Sim}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_{adv}) \geq \epsilon$ **and** $\|\mathcal{X}_{adv} - \mathcal{X}\| \leq \theta$

then

 | **return** \mathcal{X}_{adv} // Success

end

end

 // One perturbation

$\mathcal{X}_{adv} \leftarrow [x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, s_j, \dots, x_m]$

end

return

Code Repair refines code by automatically fixing bugs. The publicly available code repair dataset (Tufano et al., 2019) consists of buggy Java functions as source and their corresponding fixed functions as target. We use the *small* subset of the data with 46,680 train, 5,835 validation, and 5,835 test samples (≤ 50 tokens in each function).

Code Summarization involves generating natural language summary for a given code. We use the CodeSearchNet dataset (Husain et al., 2019) which consists of code and their corresponding summaries in natural language. We show the results of our model on Python (252K/14K/15K), Java (165K/5K/11K), and PHP (241K/13K/15K). The numbers in the bracket denote the approximate samples in train/development/test set, respectively.

4.2 Victim Models

We pick a representative method from different categories as our victim models to attack.

- **CodeT5** (Wang et al., 2021): A unified pre-trained *encoder-decoder* transformer-based PL model that leverages code semantics by using

an identifier-aware pre-training objective. This is the state-of-the-art on several sub-tasks in the CodeXGlue benchmark (Lu et al., 2021).

- **CodeBERT** (Feng et al., 2020): A bimodal pre-trained *programming language model* that performs code-code and code-nl tasks.
- **GraphCodeBert** (Guo et al., 2020): Pre-trained *graph programming language model* that leverages *code structure* through data flow graphs.
- **RoBERTa** (Liu et al., 2019): Pre-trained *natural language model* with state-of-art results on GLUE (Wang et al., 2018), RACE (Lai et al., 2017), and SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) datasets.

For our experiments, we use the publicly available fine-tuned checkpoints for CodeT5 and fine-tune CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, and RoBERTa on the related downstream tasks.

4.3 CodeAttack Configurations

The proposed CodeAttack model is implemented in PyTorch. For the purpose of our experiments, we use the publicly available pre-trained CodeBERT (MLM) masked PL model as the adversarial example generator. We select the top 50 predictions for each vulnerable token as the initial search space. On an average, we only attack at 2 to 4 vulnerable tokens for all the tasks to keep the perturbations to a minimum. The cosine similarity threshold between the original code snippet and adversarially generated code is 0.5. Since CodeAttack does not require any training, we attack the victim models on the test set using a batch-size of 256. All experiments were conducted on a 48 GiB RTX 8000 GPU.

4.4 Evaluation Metric

Downstream Performance. We measure the downstream performance using CodeBLEU (Ren et al., 2020) and BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) *before* and *after* the attack. CodeBLEU measures the quality of the generated code snippet for code translation and code repair, and BLEU measures the quality of the generated natural language code summary. To measure the efficacy of the attack model, we define

$$\Delta_{drop} = Q_{\text{before}} - Q_{\text{after}} = Q(\mathcal{Y}) - Q(\mathcal{Y}_{adv})$$

where $Q = \{\text{CodeBLEU}, \text{BLEU}\}$, \mathcal{Y} is the output sequence generated from the original code \mathcal{X} , and

Task	Victim Model	Attack Model	Downstream Performance			Attack Quality			Overall (GMean)
			Before	After	Δ_{drop}	Attack%	#Query	CodeBLEU _q	
Translate (Code-Code)	CodeT5	TextFooler		68.08	5.91	28.29	94.95	63.19	21.94
		BERT-Attack	73.99	48.59	25.40	<u>83.12</u>	186.1	51.11	47.61
		CodeAttack		<u>61.72</u>	<u>12.27</u>	89.3	36.84	65.91	41.64
	CodeBERT	TextFooler		60.45	10.71	49.2	73.91	<u>66.61</u>	32.74
		BERT-Attack	71.16	<u>58.80</u>	<u>12.36</u>	<u>97.1</u>	<u>48.76</u>	59.90	<u>41.58</u>
		CodeAttack		54.14	17.03	97.7	26.43	66.89	48.09
GraphCodeBERT	Textfooler		46.51	20.29	38.70	83.17	<u>63.62</u>	36.83	
	BERT-Attack	66.80	36.54	30.26	<u>97.33</u>	<u>41.30</u>	57.41	55.30	
	CodeAttack		<u>38.81</u>	<u>27.99</u>	98	20.60	65.39	56.39	
Repair (Code-Code)	CodeT5	Textfooler		57.59	3.53	58.84	90.50	69.53	24.36
		BERT-Attack	61.13	52.70	8.42	<u>98.3</u>	<u>74.99</u>	55.94	<u>35.79</u>
		CodeAttack		<u>53.21</u>	<u>7.92</u>	99.36	30.68	<u>69.03</u>	37.87
	CodeBERT	Textfooler		53.55	7.78	81.61	<u>45.89</u>	68.16	35.11
		BERT-Attack	61.33	51.95	9.38	<u>98.3</u>	<u>74.99</u>	55.94	<u>37.22</u>
		CodeAttack		<u>52.02</u>	<u>9.31</u>	99.39	25.98	<u>68.05</u>	39.78
GraphCodeBERT	Textfooler		54.23	7.92	78.92	<u>51.07</u>	67.89	34.89	
	BERT-Attack	62.16	<u>53.33</u>	8.83	99.4	62.59	56.05	<u>36.64</u>	
	CodeAttack		51.97	10.19	99.52	24.67	<u>66.16</u>	40.63	
Summarize (Code-NL)	CodeT5	TextFooler		14.96	5.70	64.6	<u>410.15</u>	53.91	27.08
		BERT-Attack	20.06	<u>11.96</u>	<u>8.70</u>	90.4	1006.28	51.34	34.30
		CodeAttack		11.06	9.59	<u>82.8</u>	314.87	<u>52.67</u>	34.71
	CodeBERT	Textfooler		14.38	5.37	61.1	<u>358.43</u>	54.10	26.10
		BERT-Attack	19.76	<u>11.30</u>	<u>8.35</u>	93.74	695.03	50.31	<u>34.16</u>
		CodeAttack		10.88	8.87	<u>88.32</u>	204.46	<u>52.95</u>	34.62
RoBERTa	TextFooler		14.06	4.99	62.6	356.68	54.11	25.67	
	BERT-Attack	19.06	<u>11.34</u>	<u>7.71</u>	94.15	701.01	50.10	<u>33.14</u>	
	CodeAttack		10.98	8.08	<u>87.51</u>	183.22	<u>53.03</u>	33.47	

Table 2: Results for adversarial attack on translation (C#-Java), repair (Java-Java), and summarization (PHP) tasks. The downstream performance for Code-Code tasks is measured in CodeBLEU; and for Code-NL task in BLEU. The best result is in **boldface**; the next best is underlined. Overall CodeAttack outperforms significantly ($p < 0.05$).

\mathcal{Y}_{adv} is the sequence generated from the perturbed code \mathcal{X}_{adv} .

Attack Quality. We automatically measure the attack quality using the following.

- **Attack %:** Computes the % of successful attacks as measured by the Δ_{drop} . Higher the value, more successful the attack.
- **# Query:** Under a black-box setting, the adversary can query the victim model to check for changes in the output logits. Lower the average number of queries required per sample, more efficient the adversary.
- **# Perturbation:** The number of tokens perturbed on average to generate an adversarial code. Lower the value, more imperceptible the attack.

To measure the quality of the perturbed code, we calculate $\text{CodeBLEU}_q = \text{CodeBLEU}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_{adv})$. Higher the CodeBLEU_q , better the quality of the

adversarial code. Since we want the Δ_{drop} to be as high as possible while maintaining the attack % and CodeBLEU_q , we measure the geometric mean (GMean) between Δ_{drop} , attack%, and the CodeBLEU_q to measure the overall performance.

4.5 Results

The results for attacking pre-trained PL models for (i) Code Translation, (ii) Code Repair, and (iii) Code Summarization are shown in Table 2. Due to lack of space, we only show results for the C# to Java translation task and for the PHP code summarization task (refer to Appendix A for results on Java-C# translation and code summarization results on Python and Java). We use the metrics described in Section 4.4 and compare our model with two state-of-the-art adversarial NLP baselines: (i) TextFooler (Jin et al., 2020), and (ii) BERT-Attack (Li et al., 2020).

Downstream Performance Drop. The average Δ_{drop} using CodeAttack is at least 20% for code

Original Code	TextFooler	BERT-Attack	CodeAttack
<pre>public string GetFullMessage () { ... if (msgB < 0){return string .Empty;} ... return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, raw, msgB, raw. .Length); }</pre> <p>CodeBLEU_{before}: 77.09</p>	<pre>citizenship string GetFullMessage() { ... if (msgB < 0){return string .Empty;} ... return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, raw, msgB, raw. .Length); }</pre> <p>Δ_{drop}: 18.84; CodeBLEU_q: 95.11</p>	<pre>loop string GetFullMessage() { ... if (msgB < 0){return string .Empty;} ... return [UNK] [UNK] . [UNK] (*) raw, msgB, raw.Length); }</pre> <p>Δ_{drop}: 15.09; CodeBLEU_q: 57.46</p>	<pre>public string GetFullMessage () { ... if (msgB = 0){return string .Empty;} ... return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, raw, msgB, raw. .Length); }</pre> <p>Δ_{drop}: 21.04; CodeBLEU_q: 88.65</p>
<pre>public override void WriteByte(byte b) { if (outerInstance.upto == outerInstance. blockSize) { ... } }</pre> <p>CodeBLEU_{before}: 100</p>	<pre>audiences revoked canceling WriteByte(byte b) { if (outerInstance.upto == outerInstance. blockSize) { ... } }</pre> <p>Δ_{drop}: 5.74; CodeBLEU_q: 63.28</p>	<pre>public override void [UNK] [UNK] () b) { if (outerInstance.upto == outerInstance. blockSize) { ... } }</pre> <p>Δ_{drop}: 27.26; CodeBLEU_q: 49.87</p>	<pre>public override void WriteByte(bytes b) { if (outerInstance.upto == outerInstance. blockSize) { ... } }</pre> <p>Δ_{drop}: 20.04; CodeBLEU_q: 91.69</p>

Table 3: Qualitative examples of perturbed codes using TextFooler, BERT-Attack, and CodeAttack on Code Translation task.




Figure 2: Effectiveness of the attack models on CodeT5 for the code translation task (C#-Java).

translation task and 10% for both code repair task and code summarization tasks for all three pre-trained models. Δ_{drop} is higher for BERT-Attack for translation and repair tasks but its attack quality (described later) is the lowest. CodeAttack has the best Δ_{drop} for summarization.

Attack Quality. We observe that CodeAttack has the highest attack success % for code translation and the code repair tasks; and the second best success rate for the code summarization task. CodeAttack is more efficient as it has the lowest average query number per sample. This shows that it successfully attacks more samples with less querying. Table 3 presents some qualitative examples of the generated adversarial code snippets from different attack models. TextFooler has the best CodeBLEU_q (as seen in Table 2) but it replaces keywords with closely related natural language words (‘public’: ‘citizenship’/‘audiences’; ‘override’: ‘revoked’, ‘void’: ‘cancelling’). BERT-Attack has the lowest CodeBLEU_q and substitutes tokens with either a special ‘[UNK]’ token or with other seemingly random words. This is expected since both TextFooler and BERT-Attack have not been designed for programming languages. On the other hand, although CodeAttack has the second best CodeBLEU_q, it generates more meaningful adversarial samples by replacing variables

and operators which are imperceptible.

Effectiveness. To study the effectiveness of CodeAttack, we limit the # perturbations. (Figure 2). From Figure 2a, we observe that as the perturbation % increases, the CodeBLEU_{after} for CodeAttack decreases but remains constant for TextFooler and slightly increases for BERT-Attack. We also observe that although CodeBLEU_q for CodeAttack is the second best (Figure 2b), it has the highest attack success rate (Figure 2d) and the lowest number of required queries (Figure 2c) throughout. This shows the efficiency of CodeAttack and the need for code specific adversarial attacks.

Overall Performance. Overall, CodeAttack has the best performance when we consider the geometric mean (GMean) between Δ_{drop} , attack %, and CodeBLEU_q together. These results are generalizable across different input programming languages and different downstream tasks (C# in case of code translation; Java in case of code repair, PHP in case of code summarization).

4.6 Ablation Study

We conduct an ablation study to evaluate the importance of selecting vulnerable tokens (V) and applying constraints (C) to maintain the syntax of




Figure 3: Ablation Study for Code Translation (C#-Java): Performance of CodeAttack with (+) and without (-) the vulnerable tokens (V) and the two constraints (C): (i) Operator level (C1), and (ii) Token level (C2).

the perturbed code. Figure 3 shows the results for the ablation study on the code translation task from C#-Java. See Appendix A for qualitative examples.

Importance of Vulnerable Tokens. We define a variant, CodeAttack+V-C, which finds vulnerable tokens based on logit information (Section 3.2.1) and substitutes them, albeit without any constraints. We create another variant, CodeAttack-V-C, which randomly samples tokens from the input code to attack. As can be seen from Figure 3a, the latter attack is not as effective as the Δ_{drop} is less than the former for the same CodeBLEU_q (Figure 3b) and the attack% (Figure 3d).

Importance of Constraints. We substitute the vulnerable tokens using the predictions from a masked PL model with (+C) and without (-C) any code specific constraints. We apply two types of constraints: (i) Operator level constraint (CodeAttack+V+C1), and (ii) Token level constraint (CodeAttack+V+C1+C2) (Section 3.2.2). Only applying the first constraint results in lower attack success % (Figure 3d) and Δ_{drop} (Figure 3a) but a much higher CodeBLEU_q. On applying both the constraints together, the Δ_{drop} and the attack success % improve. Overall, the final model, CodeAttack+V+C1+C2, has the best tradeoff between the Δ_{drop} , attack success %, CodeBLEU_q, and #Queries required.

Human Evaluation. We sample 50 original and perturbed Java and C# code samples and shuffle them to create a mix. We ask 3 human annotators, familiar with the two programming languages, to classify the code as either original or adversarial. We also ask them to rate the syntactic correctness of the codes on a scale of 1 to 5; where 1 is completely incorrect syntax; and 5 is the perfect syntax. On an average, 72.10% of the codes were classified as original and the average syntactic correctness

was 4.14 for the adversarial code. Additionally, we provided the annotators with pairs of original and adversarial codes and asked them to rate the 'visual' similarity between them using 0 to 1; where 0 is not similar at all, 0.5 is somewhat similar, and 1 is very similar. On average, the similarity was 0.71.

5 Discussions and Limitations

We observe that it is easier to attack the code translation task than the code repair or code summarization tasks. Since code repair aims to fix bugs in the given code snippet, attacking it is more challenging. For code summarization, the BLEU score drops by almost 50%. For all three tasks, CodeT5 is the most robust whereas GraphCodeBERT is the most susceptible to attacks using CodeAttack. CodeT5 has been pre-trained on the task of Masked Identifier Prediction or deobfuscation (Lachaux et al., 2021) where changing the identifier names does not have an impact on the code semantics. This helps the model avoid the attacks which involve changing the identifier names, and in turn makes it more robust. GraphCodeBERT, on the other hand, uses data flow graphs in their pre-training which relies on the predicting the relationship between the identifiers. Since CodeAttack modifies the identifiers and perturbs the relationship between them, it proves extremely effective on GraphCodeBERT. This results in a more significant Δ_{drop} on GraphCodeBERT compared to other models for the code translation task.

CodeAttack, although effective has a few limitations. These adversarial attacks can be avoided if the pre-trained models choose to compile the input code before processing. The PL models can also be made more robust by either additionally pre-training or fine-tuning them using the generated adversarial examples. Incorporating more tasks such as code obfuscation in the pre-training stage might also help with the robustness of the models.

6 Conclusion

We introduce a black-box adversarial attack model, CodeAttack, to detect vulnerabilities of the state-of-the-art programming language models. CodeAttack finds the most vulnerable tokens in the given code snippet and uses a greedy search mechanism to identify contextualised substitutes subject to code-specific constraints. Our model incorporates the syntactic information of the input code to generate adversarial examples that are effective, imperceptible, maintain code fluency, and consistency. We perform an extensive empirical and human evaluation to demonstrate the transferability of CodeAttack on several code-code and code-NL tasks across different programming languages. CodeAttack outperforms the existing state-of-the-art adversarial NLP models when both the performance drop and the attack quality are taken together. CodeAttack uses fewer queries and is more efficient, highlighting the need for code-specific adversarial attacks.

References

- Wasi Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. Unified pre-training for program understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2655–2668.
- Moustafa Alzantot, Yash Sharma, Ahmed Elgohary, Bo-Jhang Ho, Mani Srivastava, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2018. Generating natural language adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2890–2896.
- Leonhard Applis, Annibale Panichella, and Arie van Deursen. 2021. Assessing robustness of ml-based program analysis tools using metamorphic program transformations. In *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 1377–1381. IEEE.
- Javid Ebrahimi, Anyi Rao, Daniel Lowd, and Dejing Dou. 2018. Hotflip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 31–36.
- Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1536–1547.
- Ji Gao, Jack Lanchantin, Mary Lou Soffa, and Yanjun Qi. 2018. Black-box generation of adversarial text sequences to evade deep learning classifiers. In *2018 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*, pages 50–56. IEEE.
- Siddhant Garg and Goutham Ramakrishnan. 2020. Bae: Bert-based adversarial examples for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6174–6181.
- Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Shuai Lu, Zhangyin Feng, Duyu Tang, LIU Shujie, Long Zhou, Nan Duan, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. 2020. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yu-Lun Hsieh, Minhao Cheng, Da-Cheng Juan, Wei Wei, Wen-Lian Hsu, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. 2019. On the robustness of self-attentive models. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1520–1529.
- Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2019. Code-searchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436*.

- 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 *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8018–8025.
- Marie-Anne Lachaux, Baptiste Roziere, Marc Szafraniec, and Guillaume Lample. 2021. Dobf: A deobfuscation pre-training objective for programming languages. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- Guokun Lai, Qizhe Xie, Hanxiao Liu, Yiming Yang, and Eduard Hovy. 2017. Race: Large-scale reading comprehension dataset from examinations. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 785–794.
- J Li, S Ji, T Du, B Li, and T Wang. 2019. Textbugger: Generating adversarial text against real-world applications. In *26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- Linyang Li, Ruotian Ma, Qipeng Guo, Xiangyang Xue, and Xipeng Qiu. 2020. Bert-attack: Adversarial attack against bert using bert. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6193–6202.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin B. Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, Ge Li, Lidong Zhou, Linjun Shou, Long Zhou, Michele Tufano, Ming Gong, Ming Zhou, Nan Duan, Neel Sundaresan, Shao Kun Deng, Shengyu Fu, and Shujie Liu. 2021. Codexglue: A machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. *CoRR*, abs/2102.04664.
- Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W Rosenbluth, Marshall N Rosenbluth, Augusta H Teller, and Edward Teller. 1953. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The journal of chemical physics*, 21(6):1087–1092.
- Nicolas Papernot, Fartash Faghri, Nicholas Carlini, Ian Goodfellow, Reuben Feinman, Alexey Kurakin, Cihang Xie, Yash Sharma, Tom Brown, Aurko Roy, et al. 2016. Technical report on the cleverhans v2. 1.0 adversarial examples library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.00768*.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. **Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation**. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danish Pruthi, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Zachary C Lipton. 2019. Combating adversarial misspellings with robust word recognition. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5582–5591.
- Ruchir Puri, David S Kung, Geert Janssen, Wei Zhang, Giacomo Domeniconi, Vladimir Zolotov, Julian Dolby, Jie Chen, Mihir Choudhury, Lindsey Decker, et al. 2021. Project codenet: a large-scale ai for code dataset for learning a diversity of coding tasks.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. **SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text**. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Goutham Ramakrishnan, Jordan Henkel, Zi Wang, Aws Albarghouthi, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Reps. 2020. Semantic robustness of models of source code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03043*.
- Shuhuai Ren, Yihe Deng, Kun He, and Wanxiang Che. 2019. **Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency**. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1085–1097, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuo Ren, Daya Guo, Shuai Lu, Long Zhou, Shujie Liu, Duyu Tang, Neel Sundaresan, Ming Zhou, Ambrosio Blanco, and Shuai Ma. 2020. Codebleu: a method for automatic evaluation of code synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10297*.
- Michele Tufano, Cody Watson, Gabriele Bavota, Massimiliano Di Penta, Martin White, and Denys Poshyvanyk. 2019. An empirical study on learning bugfixing patches in the wild via neural machine translation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)*, 28(4):1–29.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 353–355.
- Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8696–8708.

- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, et al. 2016. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144*.
- Puyudi Yang, Jianbo Chen, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Jane-Ling Wang, and Michael I Jordan. 2020. Greedy attack and gumbel attack: Generating adversarial examples for discrete data. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(43):1–36.
- Zhou Yang, Jieke Shi, Junda He, and David Lo. 2022. Natural attack for pre-trained models of code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08698*.
- Noam Yefet, Uri Alon, and Eran Yahav. 2020. Adversarial examples for models of code. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 4(OOPSLA):1–30.
- Huangzhao Zhang, Zhuo Li, Ge Li, Lei Ma, Yang Liu, and Zhi Jin. 2020. Generating adversarial examples for holding robustness of source code processing models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 1169–1176.
- Yaqin Zhou, Shangqing Liu, Jingkai Siow, Xiaoning Du, and Yang Liu. 2019. Devign: Effective vulnerability identification by learning comprehensive program semantics via graph neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Yu Zhou, Xiaoqing Zhang, Juanjuan Shen, Tingting Han, Taolue Chen, and Harald Gall. 2021. Adversarial robustness of deep code comment generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00213*.

A Appendix

A.1 Results

Downstream Performance and Attack Quality

We measure the BLEU, Δ_{BLEU} , EM Δ_{EM} , CodeBLEU, and $\Delta_{CodeBLEU}$ to measure the downstream performance for code-code tasks (code repair and code translation). The programming languages used are C#-Java and Java-C# for translation tasks; and Java for code repair tasks (Table 4 and Table 5). We measure code-NL task for code summarization in BLEU and Δ_{BLEU} . We show the results for three programming languages: Python, Java, and PHP (Table 6). We measure the quality of the attacks using the metric defined in 4.4 and additionally show $BLEU_q$ which measures the BLEU score between the original and the perturbed code. The results follow a similar pattern as that seen in Section 4.5.

Ablation Study: Qualitative Analysis Table 7 shows the adversarial examples generated using the variants described in Section 4.6.

Task	Victim	Attack	BLEU (Δ_{BLEU})	EM (Δ_{EM})	CodeBLEU (Δ_{CB})
Java-C#	CodeT5	Original	85.37	67.9	87.03
		TextFooler	77.47 (7.9)	47.0 (20.9)	79.83 (7.19)
		BERT-Attack	59.38 (25.99)	13.2 (54.7)	66.92 (20.11)
		CodeAttack	64.85 (20.52)	5.2 (62.7)	68.81 (18.21)
	CodeBERT	Original	81.81	62.5	83.48
		TextFooler	71.26 (10.55)	30.4 (32.1)	73.52 (9.95)
		BERT-Attack	54.25 (27.56)	3.1 (59.4)	54.69 (28.79)
		CodeAttack	65.31* (16.5)	9 (53.5)	66.99* (16.49)
	GraphCodeBERT	Original	80.35	59.4	82.4
		TextFooler	72.15 (8.2)	35.24 (24.16)	74.32 (8.07)
		BERT-Attack	54.54 (25.81)	2.4 (57)	54.47 (27.93)
		CodeAttack	62.35* (18)	9.4 (50)	64.87 (17.52)
C#-Java	CodeT5	Original	81.54	70.6	73.99
		TextFooler	72.62 (8.92)	50 (20.6)	68.08 (5.91)
		BERT-Attack	45.71 (35.83)	15.54 (55.06)	48.59 (25.40)
		CodeAttack	58.05 (23.49)	11 (59.6)	61.72 (12.27)
	CodeBERT	Original	77.24	62	71.16
		TextFooler	67.31 (9.93)	34 (28)	60.45 (10.71)
		BERT-Attack	48.74 (28.5)	2 (60)	58.80 (12.36)
		CodeAttack	59.41 (17.83)	2.4 (59.6)	54.14 (17.02)
	GraphCodeBERT	Original	70.97	56.5	66.80
		TextFooler	62.49 (8.48)	37.33 (19.17)	46.51 (20.29)
		BERT-Attack	43.2 (55.39)	1.11 (30.26)	36.54 (27.77)
		CodeAttack	48.83 (22.14)	2.6 (53.9)	38.81 (27.99)
Repair	CodeT5	Original	78.11	19.9	61.13
		TextFooler	73.23 (4.88)	1.4(18.5)	57.59 (3.53)
		BERT-Attack	65.86 (12.25)	1.2 (18.7)	52.70 (8.42)
		CodeAttack	66.1 (12.01)	1.28 (18.62)	53.21 (7.92)
	CodeBERT	Original	78.66	15.64	61.33
		TextFooler	67.06 (11.6)	4.48 (11.16)	53.55 (7.78)
		BERT-Attack	60.52 (18.14)	3.4 (12.24)	51.95 (9.38)
		CodeAttack	61.23 (17.43)	4.05 (11.59)	52.02 (9.31)
	GraphCodeBERT	Original	79.73	15.05	62.16
		TextFooler	66.19 (13.54)	2.5 (12.55)	54.23 (7.92)
		BERT-Attack	64.1 (15.63)	3.5 (11.55)	53.33 (8.83)
		CodeAttack	64.7 (15.03)	4.38 (10.67)	51.97 (10.19)

Table 4: Downstream Performance: Code-Code Tasks. Best result in **bold** and the next best is underlined.

Task	Victim	Attack	Attack%	Query#	BLEU _q	CodeBLEU _q	
Java-C#	CodeT5	TextFooler	32.3	62.9	78.95	81.28	
		BERT-Attack	<u>85.6</u>	112.5	54.95	69.48	
		CodeAttack	94.8	19.85	68.08	75.21*	
	CodeBERT	TextFooler	55.9	38.57	82.75	83.93	
		BERT-Attack	95.39	46.09	54.75	76.18	
		CodeAttack	<u>91.1</u>	24.42	<u>66.89</u>	76.77*	
	GraphCodeBERT	TextFooler	51.21	39.33	82.41	82.45	
		BERT-Attack	96.2	38.29*	53.46	73.55	
		CodeAttack	90.8*	23.22	<u>68.42</u>	<u>77.33</u>	
	C#-Java	CodeT5	TextFooler	28.29	94.95*	69.47	63.19*
			BERT-Attack	<u>83.12</u>	186.1	41.45	51.11
			CodeAttack	89.3	36.84	<u>67.09</u>	65.91
CodeBERT		TextFooler	49.2	73.91	73.19	66.61	
		BERT-Attack	<u>97.1</u>	48.76	52.33	59.90	
		CodeAttack	97.7	26.43	<u>66.24</u>	66.89	
GraphCodeBERT		TextFooler	38.70	83.17	70.61	63.62	
		BERT-Attack	<u>97.33</u>	41.30	55.71	57.41	
		CodeAttack	98	20.60	<u>68.07</u>	65.39	
Repair		CodeT5	TextFooler	58.84	90.50	93.37	69.53
			BERT-Attack	<u>98.1</u>	121.1	80.56	55.49
			CodeAttack	99.36	30.68	88.95*	69.03*
	CodeBERT	TextFooler	81.61	45.89	91.82	68.16	
		BERT-Attack	<u>98.3</u>	74.99	80.7	55.94	
		CodeAttack	99.39	25.98	<u>87.83</u>	<u>68.05</u>	
	GraphCodeBERT	TextFooler	78.92	51.07	91.4	67.89	
		BERT-Attack	<u>99.4</u>	62.59	81.73	56.05	
		CodeAttack	99.52	24.67	<u>85.68</u>	<u>66.16</u>	

Table 5: Attack Quality: Code-Code Tasks. Best result in **bold** and the next best is underlined.

Task	Victim	Attack	BLEU (Δ_{BLEU})	Attack%	Query#	BLEU _q	CodeBLEU _q
Java	CodeT5	Original	19.77				
		TextFooler	14.06 (5.71)	67.8	<u>291.82</u>	75.33	92.82
		BERT-Attack	11.94 (7.82)	93.34	541.43	54.47	48.35
		CodeAttack	<u>11.21 (8.56)</u>	<u>80.8</u>	198.11	<u>68.51</u>	<u>90.04</u>
	CodeBERT	Original	17.65				
		TextFooler	16.84 (1.20)	42.4	<u>400.78</u>	65.88	90.29
		BERT-Attack	12.87 (4.77)	84.6	<u>826.71</u>	34.51	83.82
		CodeAttack	<u>14.69 (2.85)</u>	<u>73.7</u>	340.99	59.74	<u>59.37</u>
	RoBERTa	Original	16.47				
		TextFooler	13.23 (3.23)	44.9	<u>383.36</u>	67.9	90.87
		BERT-Attack	<u>12.67 (3.8)</u>	72.93	901.01	28.18	42.09
		CodeAttack	11.74(4.73)	<u>50.14</u>	346.07	<u>32.63</u>	<u>48.48</u>
PHP	CodeT5	Original	20.66				
		TextFooler	14.96 (5.70)	64.6	<u>410.15</u>	78.11	53.91
		BERT-Attack	<u>11.96 (8.70)</u>	90.4	1006.28	49.3	51.34
		CodeAttack	11.06 (9.59)	<u>82.8</u>	314.87	<u>66.02</u>	<u>52.67</u>
	CodeBERT	Original	19.76				
		TextFooler	14.38 (5.37)	61.1	<u>358.43</u>	79.81	54.10
		BERT-Attack	<u>11.30 (8.45)</u>	93.74	695.03	50.77	50.31
		CodeAttack	10.88 (8.87)	<u>88.32</u>	204.46	<u>69.11</u>	<u>52.95</u>
	RoBERTa	Original	19.06				
		TextFooler	14.06 (4.99)	62.6	<u>356.68</u>	79.73	54.11
		BERT-Attack	<u>11.34 (7.71)</u>	94.15	701.01	51.49	50.10
		CodeAttack	10.98 (8.08)	<u>87.51</u>	183.22	<u>70.33</u>	<u>53.03</u>
Python	CodeT5	Original	20.26				
		TextFooler	12.11 (8.24)	90.47	<u>400.06</u>	<u>86.84</u>	77.59
		BERT-Attack	<u>8.22 (12.13)</u>	99.81	718.07	77.11	64.66
		CodeAttack	7.79 (12.38)	<u>98.50</u>	174.05	87.04	<u>69.17</u>
	CodeBERT	Original	78.66				
		TextFooler	20.76 (5.40)	68.5	<u>966.19</u>	76.56	75.15
		BERT-Attack	<u>18.95 (7.21)</u>	93.72	1414.67	55.22	52.31
		CodeAttack	18.69 (7.47)	<u>86.63</u>	560.58	63.84	<u>59.11</u>
	RoBERTa	Original	17.01				
		TextFooler	10.72 (6.29)	63.34	<u>788.25</u>	70.48	74.05
		BERT-Attack	<u>10.66 (6.35)</u>	89.64	<u>1358.85</u>	51.74	56.75
		CodeAttack	9.5 (7.51)	<u>76.09</u>	661.75	<u>55.45</u>	<u>61.22</u>

Table 6: Downstream Performance and Attack Quality on Code-NL (Summarization) Task for different programming languages. Best result in **bold** and the next best is underlined.

Original Code	CodeAttack+V-C	CodeAttack+V+C1	CodeAttack+V+C1+C2
<pre>public void AddMultipleBlanks (MulBlankRecord mbr) { for (int j = 0; j < mbr. NumColumns; j++) { BlankRecord br = new BlankRecord(); br.Column = j + mbr. FirstColumn; br.Row = mbr.Row; br.XFIndex = (mbr.GetXFat (j)); InsertCell(br); } }</pre>	<pre>((void AddMultipleBlanks(MulBlankRecord mbr) { for (int j ? 0; j < mbr .NumColumns; j++) { BlankRecord br = new BlankRecord(); br.Column = j + mbr. FirstColumn; br.Row = mbr.Row; br.XFIndex = (mbr. GetXFat(j)); InsertCell(br); } })</pre>	<pre>public void AddMultipleBlanks (MulBlankRecord mbr) { for (int j > 0; j < mbr. NumColumns; j++) { BlankRecord br = -new BlankRecord(); br.Column = j + mbr. FirstColumn; br.Row = mbr.Row; br.XFIndex > (mbr.GetXFat (j)); InsertCell(br); } }</pre>	<pre>static void AddMultipleBlanks (MulBlankRecord mbr) { for (int j > 0; jj < mbr. NumColumns; jj++) { BlankRecord br = new BlankRecord(); br.Column = j + mbr. FirstColumn; br.Row = mbr.Row; br.XFIndex = (mbr.GetXFat (j)); InsertCell(br); } }</pre>
CodeBLEU _{before} : 76.3	Δ_{drop} : 7.21; CodeBLEU _q : 43.85	Δ_{drop} : 5.85; CodeBLEU _q : 69.61	Δ_{drop} : 12.96; CodeBLEU _q : 59.29
<pre>public string GetFullMessage () { byte[] raw = buffer; int msgB = RawParseUtils. TagMessage(raw, 0); if (msgB < 0) { return string.Empty; } Encoding enc = RawParseUtils. ParseEncoding(raw); return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, raw, msgB, raw. Length); }</pre>	<pre>0120public string GetFullMessage() { byte[] raw = buffer; int msgB = RawParseUtils. TagMessage(raw, 0); if (msgB < 0) { return string.Empty; } Encoding enc = RawParseUtils. ParseEncoding(raw); return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, RAW, msgB, raw.Length); }</pre>	<pre>public string GetFullMessage () { byte[] raw = buffer; int msgB = RawParseUtils. TagMessage(raw, 0); if (msgB = 0) { return string.Empty; } Encoding enc = RawParseUtils. ParseEncoding(raw); return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, raw, msgB, raw. Length); }</pre>	<pre>static string GetFullMessage () { byte[] raw = buffer; int msgB = RawParseUtils. TagMessage(raw, 0); if (msgB < 0 { return string.Empty; } Encoding enc = RawParseUtils. ParseEncoding(raw); return RawParseUtils.Decode (enc, raw, MsgB, raw. Length); }</pre>
CodeBLEU _{before} : 77.09	Δ_{drop} : 10.42; CodeBLEU _q : 64.19	Δ_{drop} : 21.93; CodeBLEU _q : 87.25	Δ_{drop} : 22.8; CodeBLEU _q : 71.30

Table 7: Qualitative examples for the ablation study on CodeAttack: Attack vulnerable tokens (V) without any constraints (-C), with operator level constraints (+C1), and with token level (+C2) constraints on code translation task.