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## Introduction


>The recent success of vision-language (VL) pre-trained models on multimodal tasks have attracted broad attention from both academics and industry. However, the adversarial robustness is still relatively unexplored.
>Therefore, we ask the following question: Can we generate adversarial perturbations on a pre-trained VL model to attack various black-box downstream tasks fine-tuned on the pre-trained one?

## Introduction


> Task-specific challenge: The attack mechanism needs to be general and work for attacking multiple tasks.
>Model-specific challenge: The attack method needs to automatically learn the transferability between pre-trained and fine-tuned models on different modalities

## VLATTACK


$>$ Single-modal Level Attack: Attacking using a "from image to text" order as the former can be perturbed on a continuous space. Image Attack: BSA. Text Attack: BERT-Attack[1].
$>$ Multi-modal Level Attack: Cross-updating image and text perturbations at the multimodal level based on previous outputs.

## Block-wise Similarity Attack (BSA)
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## Algorithm Details


mis
Figure 12: An adversarial image from BSA


Figure 14: An adversarial image-text pair from multimodal attack.

## Algorithm 1 VLATTACK

Input: A pre-trained model $F$, a fine-tuned model $S$, a clean image-text pair $(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{T})$ and its prediction $y$ on the $S$, and the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{U}$ :
Parameters: Perturbation budget $\sigma_{i}$ on $\mathbf{I}, \sigma_{s}$ on $\mathbf{T}$. Iteration number $N$ and $N_{s}$.
1: //Single-modal Attacks: From Image to Text (Section 4.1)
2. Initialize $\mathbf{I}^{\prime}=\mathbf{I}+\delta, \delta \in \mathcal{U}(0,1), \mathcal{T}=$

3: // Image attack by updating $\mathbf{I}^{\prime}$ using Eq. (2) for $N_{s}$ steps
4: $\mathbf{I}^{\prime}=\operatorname{BSA}\left(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}, N_{s}, \sigma_{i}, F\right)$
5: if $S\left(\mathbf{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}\right) \neq y$ then return $\left(\mathbf{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}\right)$
6: else
// Text attack by applying BERT-attack
for pertubed text $\mathbf{T}_{i}^{\prime}$ in BERT-attack do
if $\gamma_{i}=\operatorname{Cos}\left(U_{s}\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}^{\prime}\right), U_{s}(\mathbf{T})\right)>\sigma_{s}$ then
Add the pair $\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}^{\prime}, \gamma_{i}\right)$ into $\mathcal{T}$;
if $S\left(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{T}_{i}^{\prime}\right) \neq y$ then return $\left(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{T}_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ end if
end if

## end if end for

4: end
17: Rank $\mathcal{T}$ according to similarity scores $\left\{\gamma_{i}\right\}$ and get top- $K$ samples $\left\{\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{1}^{\prime}, \cdots, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{K}^{\prime}\right\}$ according to Eq. (3); 18: for $k=1 \ldots K$ do
19: if $S\left(\mathbf{I}_{k}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{k}^{\prime}\right) \neq y$ then return $\left(\mathbf{I}_{k}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{k}^{\prime}\right)$
end if
Replace ( $\mathbf{I}_{k}^{\prime}, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{k}^{\prime}$ ) with ( $\mathbf{I}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}$ ) in Eq. (2)
$\mathbf{I}_{k+1}^{\prime}=\operatorname{BSA}\left(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{I}_{k}^{\prime}, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_{k}^{\prime}, N_{k}, \sigma_{i}, F\right)$
$\mathbf{I}_{k+1}=\mathrm{BSA}\left(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{I}_{k}, \mathbf{T}_{k}^{\prime}, N_{k}, \sigma_{i}, F\right)$
if $S\left(\mathbf{I}_{k+1}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{k}^{\prime}\right) \neq y$ then return $\left(\mathbf{I}_{k+1}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{k}^{\prime}\right)$
end if
25: end for

26: return None

## Experimets

Table 1: Comparison of VLAtTACK with baselines on ViLT, Unitab, and OFA for different tasks, respectively. All results are displayed by ASR (\%). B\&A means the BERT-Attack approach.

| Pre-trained Model | Task | Dataset | Image Only |  |  | BSA | Text Only |  | multimodality |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | DR | SSP | FDA |  | B\&A | R\&R | Co-Attack | VLAttack |
| ViLT | VQA | VQAv2 | 23.89 | 50.36 | 29.27 | 65.20 | 17.24 | 8.69 | 35.13 | 78.05 |
|  | VR | NLVR2 | 21.58 | 35.13 | 22.60 | 52.17 | 32.18 | 24.82 | 42.04 | 66.65 |
| BLIP | VQA | VQAv2 | 7.04 | 11.84 | 7.12 | 26.36 | 21.04 | 2.94 | 14.24 | 49.26 |
|  | VR | NLVR2 | 6.66 | 6.88 | 10.22 | 27.16 | 33.08 | 16.92 | 8.70 | 52.66 |
| Unitab | VQA | VQAv2 | 22.88 | 33.67 | 41.80 | 48.40 | 14.20 | 5.48 | 33.87 | 62.20 |
|  | REC | RefCOCO | 21.32 | 64.56 | 75.24 | 89.70 | 13.68 | 8.75 | 56.48 | 93.52 |
|  | REC | RefCOCO+ | 26.30 | 69.60 | 76.21 | 90.96 | 6.40 | 2.46 | 68.69 | 93.40 |
|  | REC | RefCOCOg | 26.39 | 69.26 | 78.64 | 91.31 | 22.03 | 18.52 | 65.50 | 95.61 |
| OFA | VQA | VQAv2 | 25.06 | 33.88 | 40.02 | 54.05 | 10.22 | 2.34 | 51.16 | 78.82 |
|  | VE | SNLI-VE | 13.71 | 15.11 | 20.90 | 29.19 | 10.51 | 4.92 | 18.66 | 41.78 |
|  | REC | RefCOCO | 11.60 | 16.00 | 27.06 | 40.82 | 13.15 | 7.64 | 32.04 | 56.62 |
|  | REC | RefCOCO+ | 16.58 | 22.28 | 33.26 | 46.44 | 4.66 | 7.04 | 45.28 | 58.14 |
|  | REC | RefCOCOg | 16.39 | 24.80 | 33.22 | 54.63 | 19.23 | 15.13 | 30.53 | 73.30 |

Table 2: Evaluation of the Uni-modal tasks on OFA. We highlight the prediction score reported by the original OFA paper with $*$

| Dataset | MSCOCO |  |  |  | ImageNet-1K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metric | BLEU@4 $(\downarrow)$ | METEOR $(\downarrow)$ | CIDEr $(\downarrow)$ | SPICE $(\downarrow)$ | ASR $(\uparrow)$ |
| OFA $*$ | 42.81 | 31.30 | 145.43 | 25.37 | - |
| DR | 30.26 | 24.47 | 95.52 | 17.89 | 10.43 |
| SSP | 10.99 | 12.52 | 23.54 | 5.67 | 19.44 |
| FDA | 17.77 | 17.92 | 55.75 | 11.36 | 12.31 |
| BSA (Ours) | 3.04 | 8.08 | 2.16 | 1.50 | 41.35 |

Table 3: CLIP model evaluation on SVHN.

| Dataset | SVHN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | CLIP-ViT/16 | CLIP-RN50 |
| DR | 3.32 | 71.62 |
| SSP | 6.36 | 84.26 |
| FDA | 6.20 | 83.52 |
| BSA (Ours) | 15.74 | 84.98 |

## Conclusion

>Explore the adversarial vulnerability across pre-trained and fine-tuned VL models.
$>$ We propose VLATTACK to attack from different levels.
-Extensive experiments on five VL models and six tasks.
$>$ Currently, our research problem is formulated by assuming the pre-trained and downstream models share similar structures. The adversarial transferability between different pre-trained and fine-tuned models is worth exploring, which we left to our future work.

