





### DAT: Improving Adversarial Robustness via Generative Amplitude Mix-up in Frequency Domain

Fengpeng Li<sup>1</sup>, Kemou Li<sup>1</sup>, Haiwei Wu<sup>2</sup>, Jinyu Tian<sup>3</sup>, and Jiantao Zhou<sup>1\*</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> State Key Laboratory of Internet of Things for Smart City, University of Macau
  - <sup>2</sup> Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong
- <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Innovation Engineering, Macau University of Science and Technology

## Outline

## > Background

## > Motivation

## Dual Adversarial Training



## **Adversarial Attacks**

• Adversarial Attacks generates Adversarial Examples (AEs) by adding subtle yet deceptive adversarial perturbations to benign samples.

Benign





## Motivation

The adversarial perturbation severely damages phase patterns (especially in red rectangular) and the frequency spectrum, while amplitude patterns are rarely impacted.



Motivation:

 $\mathbf{x}'_{amp} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}'), \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x})), \quad \mathbf{x}'_{pha} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}'))$ 



(a) Standard model

(b) Robust model

(c) Perturbed model

The robust and perturbed models are trained by PGD-AT-10.

#### **Conclusion:**

- 1.fig(a) shows phase patterns are severely damaged.
- 2.fig(b)Some phase patterns are still unaffected by adversarial perturbations.
- 3.fig(c)Perturbing the amplitude can force the model to focus on phase patterns.

The overview of DAT, which consists of three stages:(I) adversarial amplitude generation, (II) AE generation, and (III) joint optimization.



#### **Adversarial Amplitude Generator**

- C1.  $|h_p(\mathbf{x}) h_p(\mathbf{\hat{x}})| < \epsilon_1$ : Ensuring  $\mathbf{\hat{x}}$  retains the same semantics in the phase spectrum as  $\mathbf{x}$ .
- C2.  $F_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = F_{\theta}(\mathbf{\hat{x}})$ : Ensuring  $\mathbf{\hat{x}}$  remains distinguishable with the same label as  $\mathbf{x}$  by  $f_{\theta}$ .
- C3. |h<sub>a</sub>(x) − h<sub>a</sub>(x̂)| > ε<sub>2</sub>: Making x̂ maximize the L<sub>DAT</sub>, causing the model's difficulty fitting the amplitude of images, and forcing the model to focus on phase patterns.

$$\mathcal{A}_G(\mathbf{x}) = G_{\psi}(\mathbf{z}, f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})), \text{ where } \mathbf{z} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}).$$

Ensuring that a portion of the original amplitude information is preserved following:

$$\mathcal{A}_{mix}(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda \cdot \mathcal{A}_G(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}), \text{ where } \lambda \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1).$$

The recombined  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  is obtained by IDFT:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{mix}(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x})).$$

#### **Efficient AE Generation**

**Issues:** reducing *t* difficulty of AEs' reaching the actual maximum in the  $\ell_{\infty} - ball$ . Generally, *t*=10, doubling the training time with vanilla-AT.

$$\min_{oldsymbol{ heta}} \max_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{B}_{\epsilon}[\mathbf{x}]} \mathcal{L}_{ ext{CE}}(f(\mathbf{x}'),y) \quad \mathbf{x}'^{(t+1)} = \prod_{\mathcal{B}_{\epsilon}[\mathbf{x}]} (\mathbf{x}'^{(t)} + lpha \cdot sign(
abla_{\mathbf{x}'^{(t)}} \mathcal{L}(f(\mathbf{x}'^{(t)}),y)))$$

**Solution:** increase adversarial perturbation length in each iteration without change  $\alpha$ .

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{AE}}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}'), y) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{CE}}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}'), y) + \beta \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{KL}}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}'), f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})),$$

#### **Joint Optimization**

Optimization objective for  $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $G_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$  $\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x},y)\sim\mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}\sim p(\hat{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\psi})} \left[ \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{DAT}}(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}), f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), y) \right] \right],$ 

 $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  follows a sample-dependent conditional distribution  $p(\hat{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{x}, m{\psi})$ 

Total loss  $\mathcal{L}_{DAT}$ 

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{DAT}}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), f_{\theta}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), y) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{AT}}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{AT}}(f_{\theta}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), y)) + \omega \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{JS}}(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), f_{\theta}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})), y)$$

Adversarial Training Loss  $\mathcal{L}_{AT}$ 

Consistency Regularization Loss  $\mathcal{D}_{JS}$ 

## **Experiments**

**Settings** Training: 
$$\epsilon = \frac{8}{255}$$
,  $\alpha = \frac{2}{255}$ ,  $t = 5$  Testing:  $\epsilon = \frac{8}{255}$ 

#### **Baselines**

**Common methods:** PGD-AT, TRADES, MART, ST, SCARL,LAS-AT **Complex methods:** OA-AT, DAJAT, IDBH

Backbones: ResNet-18, WideResNet-34-10, WideResNet-28-10

Average natural and robust accuracy (%) of ResNet-18 on CIFAR-10

DATASET	Метнор	Natural	FGSM	PGD-20	PGD-100	$C\&W_{\infty}$	AA
CIFAR-10	PGD-AT [40] TRADES [64] MART [54] ST [37] SCARL [33] DAT (Ours)	$\begin{array}{c} 82.78 {\pm} 0.12 \\ 82.41 {\pm} 0.12 \\ 80.70 {\pm} 0.17 \\ 83.10 {\pm} 0.10 \\ 80.67 {\pm} 0.31 \\ \mathbf{84.17 {\pm} 0.21} \end{array}$	$56.94 \pm 0.17$ $58.47 \pm 0.19$ $58.91 \pm 0.24$ $59.42 \pm 0.32$ $58.32 \pm 0.13$ <b>62.06 \pm 0.19</b>	$51.30\pm0.16$ $52.76\pm0.08$ $54.02\pm0.29$ $54.53\pm0.14$ $54.24\pm0.17$ $57.55\pm0.15$	$50.88 \pm 0.26$ $52.47 \pm 0.13$ $53.38 \pm 0.30$ $54.31 \pm 0.17$ $54.10 \pm 0.13$ $57.47 \pm 0.17$	$\begin{array}{c} 49.72 \pm 0.24 \\ 50.43 \pm 0.17 \\ 49.35 \pm 0.27 \\ 51.35 \pm 0.21 \\ 51.93 \pm 0.15 \\ \textbf{52.59 \pm 0.13} \end{array}$	$47.63 \pm 0.08$ $49.37 \pm 0.08$ $47.49 \pm 0.23$ $50.51 \pm 0.17$ $50.45 \pm 0.11$ $51.36 \pm 0.14$
	TRADES+AWP SCARL+AWP DAT+AWP (Ours)	81.16±0.12 81.46±0.15 82.63±0.15	57.86±0.14 59.26±0.16 <b>62.78±0.21</b>	54.56±0.06 55.38±0.14 58.87±0.12	54.45±0.14 55.27±0.13 58.78±0.15	$\begin{array}{c} 50.95{\pm}0.12\\ 52.15{\pm}0.15\\ \textbf{52.88{\pm}0.21}\end{array}$	50.31±0.10 51.08±0.11 52.54±0.12

Average natural and robust accuracy (%) of ResNet-18 on CIFAR-100 and Tiny-ImageNet

DATASET	Метнор	Natural	FGSM	PGD-20	PGD-100	$C\&W_{\infty}$	AA
	PGD-AT [49]	$57.27 \pm 0.21$	$31.81 \pm 0.11$	$28.66 \pm 0.11$	$28.49 \pm 0.16$	$26.89 \pm 0.08$	$24.60 \pm 0.04$
	TRADES <mark>[61</mark> ]	$57.94 \pm 0.15$	$32.37 {\pm} 0.18$	$29.25 \pm 0.18$	$29.10 \pm 0.20$	$25.88 \pm 0.16$	$24.71 \pm 0.04$
	MART <mark>[54</mark> ]	$55.03 \pm 0.10$	$33.12 \pm 0.26$	$30.32{\pm}0.18$	$30.20 \pm 0.17$	$26.60 \pm 0.11$	$25.13 \pm 0.15$
_	ST [37]	$58.44 \pm 0.12$	$33.35 \pm 0.23$	$30.53 \pm 0.13$	$30.39 \pm 0.17$	$26.70 \pm 0.20$	$25.61 \pm 0.07$
CIFAR-100	SCARL [33]	$57.63 \pm 0.11$	$33.14 \pm 0.19$	$30.83 \pm 0.24$	$30.77 \pm 0.21$	$26.86 \pm 0.16$	$25.82 \pm 0.19$
	DAT (Ours)	62.57±0.17	36.63±0.12	33.37±0.15	33.15±0.12	$28.34{\pm}0.14$	27.11±0.15
	TRADES+AWP	$58.76 {\pm} 0.07$	$33.82{\pm}0.15$	$31.53{\pm}0.14$	$31.42{\pm}0.12$	$27.03 {\pm} 0.16$	$26.06 \pm 0.12$
	SCARL+AWP	$58.36 {\pm} 0.12$	$34.25 \pm 0.14$	$32.32 \pm 0.14$	$32.26 \pm 0.13$	$27.92 \pm 0.11$	$26.83 \pm 0.15$
	DAT+AWP (Ours)	63.28±0.11	38.22±0.14	35.29±0.13	35.18±0.12	29.43±0.17	$28.09 \pm 0.12$
	PGD-AT [49]	$46.36 {\pm} 0.22$	$23.49 \pm 0.39$	$20.41 \pm 0.29$	$20.35 {\pm} 0.37$	$17.86 {\pm} 0.28$	$14.46 \pm 0.31$
	TRADES [61]	$43.65 \pm 0.35$	$21.37 \pm 0.48$	$18.62 \pm 0.48$	$18.56 \pm 0.33$	$15.38 \pm 0.35$	$13.32 \pm 0.41$
	LAS-AT [29]	$45.27 \pm 0.35$	$24.64 \pm 0.24$	$21.82 \pm 0.27$	$21.72 \pm 0.23$	$18.07 \pm 0.25$	$16.25 \pm 0.22$
Tiny ImageNet	SCARL [33]	$49.75 \pm 0.17$	$25.52 \pm 0.16$	$22.64 \pm 0.11$	$22.58 {\pm} 0.18$	$18.77 \pm 0.27$	$16.31 \pm 0.14$
	DAT (Ours)	$52.45 \pm 0.21$	28.45±0.15	$25.47{\pm}0.12$	25.36±0.14	$20.39{\pm}0.17$	$17.51 {\pm} 0.19$
	TRADES+AWP	$46.64 {\pm} 0.35$	$26.58 {\pm} 0.19$	22.31±0.20	$22.28 \pm 0.12$	$17.84{\pm}0.11$	$15.34 \pm 0.12$
	LAS-AT+AWP	$46.85 \pm 0.13$	$25.76 {\pm} 0.12$	$23.30{\pm}0.11$	$23.05 \pm 0.15$	$19.68 \pm 0.11$	$17.98 \pm 0.15$
	DAT+AWP (Ours)	53.29±0.25	$30.91 {\pm} 0.11$	$27.25 \pm 0.13$	$\textbf{27.18}{\pm 0.16}$	$22.12 \pm 0.12$	$19.29 \pm 0.13$

## **Experiments**

Average natural and robust accuracy (%) of WideResNet34-10 on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100

Method	CIFAR-10				CIFAR-100			
	Natural	PGD-100	$C\&W_{\infty}$	AA	Natural	PGD-100	$C\&W_{\infty}$	AA
PGD-AT [40]	85.37±0.74	$54.61 \pm 0.68$	$53.42 \pm 0.82$	$52.03 {\pm} 0.68$	$60.63 \pm 1.17$	$30.83 {\pm} 0.51$	$30.21 \pm 0.83$	27.93±0.57
TRADES [61]	$85.54 {\pm} 0.59$	$56.04 {\pm} 0.45$	$53.91 {\pm} 0.46$	$53.37 {\pm} 0.51$	$61.26 \pm 0.39$	$33.11 \pm 0.42$	$30.24 {\pm} 0.58$	$28.32 \pm 0.62$
MART [54]	$85.13 {\pm} 0.52$	$58.72 \pm 0.66$	$53.02 \pm 0.37$	$51.61 \pm 0.48$	$60.52 {\pm} 0.62$	$32.34 \pm 0.62$	$29.07 \pm 0.43$	$25.91 \pm 0.36$
LAS-AT [29]	$86.07 \pm 0.31$	$55.97 {\pm} 0.47$	$55.49 \pm 0.54$	$53.34 \pm 0.42$	$61.87 {\pm} 0.57$	$32.21 \pm 0.45$	$30.47 {\pm} 0.34$	$28.91 \pm 0.39$
SCARL [33]	$84.41 \pm 0.23$	$57.81 {\pm} 0.65$	$56.21 \pm 0.47$	$54.37 \pm 0.29$	$62.41 \pm 0.36$	$34.19 {\pm} 0.46$	$30.53 {\pm} 0.31$	$29.52 \pm 0.33$
DAT (Ours)	$86.78{\pm}0.42$	$61.32{\pm}0.24$	57.62±0.34	56.46±0.33	64.53±0.25	36.75±0.43	$32.21 \pm 0.27$	30.79±0.17

Average natural and robust accuracy (%) of Complex Methods on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100

	ResNet-18				WRN-34-10			
ΜΕΤΗΟD	CIFAR-10		CIFAR-100		CIFAR-10		CIFAR-100	
	PGD-20	AA	PGD-20	AA	PGD-20	AA	PGD-20	AA
TRADES+AWP	$54.56 \pm 0.06$	50.31±0.10	$31.53 \pm 0.14$	$26.06 \pm 0.12$	59.26±0.24	$55.28 \pm 0.21$	$34.48 \pm 0.26$	29.74±0.21
TRADES+AWP+SWA	$55.21 \pm 0.24$	$51.14 \pm 0.13$	$31.72 \pm 0.23$	$26.21 \pm 0.15$	$60.25 \pm 0.26$	$55.37 \pm 0.15$	$35.16 \pm 0.23$	$29.92 \pm 0.16$
OA-AT (SWA+variable $\epsilon$ and $\alpha$ )	$56.47 \pm 0.37$	$50.83 \pm 0.24$	$32.63 \pm 0.25$	$26.84 \pm 0.36$	$60.49 \pm 0.31$	$57.91 \pm 0.18$	$36.18 \pm 0.27$	$30.35 \pm 0.23$
DAJAT (AWP+SWA+variable $\epsilon \& \alpha$ )	$56.52 \pm 0.47$	$51.85 \pm 0.26$	$32.96 \pm 0.32$	$27.83 \pm 0.29$	$62.34 \pm 0.35$	$56.62 \pm 0.23$	$37.05 \pm 0.14$	$31.51 \pm 0.17$
IDBH (AWP+SWA+variable $\epsilon$ ) [33]	$57.48 {\pm} 0.34$	$52.31 \pm 0.26$	$33.67 \pm 0.27$	$27.86 \pm 0.32$	$62.47 \pm 0.23$	$57.64 \pm 0.26$	$36.46 \pm 0.23$	$31.34 \pm 0.22$
DAT+AWP (Ours)	58.57±0.14	$52.54{\pm}0.12$	35.29±0.13	$28.09 {\pm} 0.12$	63.34±0.18	57.96±0.16	38.41±0.17	$31.62 \pm 0.12$
DAT+AWP+SWA (Ours)	$\textbf{58.84{\pm}0.16}$	$52.76{\pm}0.14$	$35.47 {\pm} 0.11$	$28.31{\pm}0.13$	63.65±0.19	$58.12{\pm}0.18$	$38.59{\pm}0.16$	$31.81 {\pm} 0.12$

## **Experiments**

The average experimental results for different augmentations on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with ResNet-18

Метнор	CIFA	R-10	CIFAR-100			
	PGD-20 AA		PGD-20	AA		
Baseline	53.13±0.51	49.64±0.62	$30.09 \pm 0.58$	25.43±0.39		
CutOut [ <mark>18</mark> ]	$55.85 {\pm} 0.51$	$50.28 {\pm} 0.14$	$31.35 \pm 0.44$	$26.26 \pm 0.14$		
CutMix [60]	$55.76 \pm 0.42$	$50.13 \pm 0.54$	$31.26 \pm 0.62$	$26.17 \pm 0.19$		
AutoAugment [14]	$56.24 \pm 0.45$	$50.42 \pm 0.15$	$31.69 {\pm} 0.52$	$26.44 \pm 0.17$		
DAT (Ours)	57.55±0.15	51.36±0.14	33.37±0.15	$27.11 \pm 0.15$		

Time consumption (s) of each training epoch for different AT methods on ResNet-18

Метнор	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100
PGD-AT [40]	187	188
TRADES [61]	187	192
ST [37]	320	326
SCARL [33]	221	228
DAT (Ours)	218	221

# Thanks