





# Backdoor Attacks and Countermeasures in Natural Language Processing Models: A Comprehensive Security Review

Pengzhou Cheng , Zongru Wu, Wei Du , Haodong Zhao , Wei Lu  *Member, IEEE*, and Gongshen Liu

**Abstract**—Applying third-party data and models has become a new paradigm for language modeling in NLP, which also introduces some potential security vulnerabilities because attackers can manipulate the training process and data source. In this case, backdoor attacks can induce the model to exhibit expected behaviors through specific triggers and have little inferior influence on primitive tasks. Hence, it could have dire consequences, especially considering that the backdoor attack surfaces are broad.

However, there is still no systematic and comprehensive review to reflect the security challenges, attacker’s capabilities, and purposes according to the attack surface. Moreover, there is a shortage of analysis and comparison of the diverse emerging backdoor countermeasures in this context. In this paper, we conduct a timely review of backdoor attacks and countermeasures to sound the red alarm for the NLP security community. According to the affected stage of the machine learning pipeline, the attack surfaces are recognized to be wide and then formalized into three categorizations: attacking pre-trained model with fine-tuning (APMF) or parameter-efficient tuning (APMP), and attacking final model with training (AFMT). Thus, attacks under each categorization are combed. The countermeasures are categorized into two general classes: sample inspection and model inspection. Overall, the research on the defense side is far behind the attack side, and there is no single defense that can prevent all types of backdoor attacks. An attacker can intelligently bypass existing defenses with a more invisible attack. Drawing the insights from the systematic review, we also present crucial areas for future research on the backdoor, such as empirical security evaluations on large language models, and in particular, more efficient and practical countermeasures are solicited.

**Index Terms**—Artificial Intelligence Security; Backdoor Attacks; Backdoor Countermeasures; Natural Language Processing

## I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, deep learning (DL) is increasingly deployed to make decisions for various critical tasks on human behalf. Natural language processing (NLP) has particularly attained unprecedented success and has been widely embraced in several downstream tasks. To satisfy superior performance,

models have to utilize a significant amount of data and computational resources, which makes individuals or small-scale organizations acquire assistance from the third-party platform [1], [2]. Despite deploying these NLP systems having potential benefits, it also coexists with realistic security threats [3], [4]. In such circumstances, attackers can compromise its security due to having certain permission for the training dataset and models [5]. NLP systems are vulnerable to various types of attacks, such as manipulating the training data to mislead the model’s behavior according to the attacker’s intentions [6]. The backdoor attack as an integrity attack, exactly fits such insidious purposes [7].

By definition, a backdoored model behaves as expected on clean inputs. When the input however is stamped with a trigger that is secretly determined by attackers, the backdoored model will make a purposeful output [8]. The former denotes the dormancy of the backdoored model, whereas the latter could lead to catastrophic consequences upon activation. The vulnerability of deep neural networks (DNN) under backdoor attacks is extensively investigated in the image domain [9]. Meanwhile, with NLP models empowering more security/safety-critical scenarios (e.g., fake news detection, toxic content filtering, and opinion mining) [5], researchers become aware of the threat of textual backdoor attacks. However, there is a well-known dissimilarity between image and language: pixel values are real numbers from a continuous space whereas text is sequences of discrete symbols.

Most textual backdoor attacks generally follow the trigger design, including fixed trigger words inserted into a specific/random position or generated triggers based on synonyms [10], syntactic [11], or paraphrases [12]. Also, the backdoor effectiveness can be improved by changing the model structure and training schedule. In Fig. 1, attackers could maliciously publish backdoored language models to several application domains. Once the victim deploys it, the attacker can casually activate and request the predefined output. It is worth noting that the backdoor attack has swept across all the textual task domains [13], [14], [15]. It is important for the backdoored language systems to maintain performance while also ensuring that the input remains natural and fluent, in order to avoid detection by humans and defense mechanisms. Hence, researchers are concentrated on presenting insidious backdoor attacks at various stages of implementation in the NLP model pipeline, with the intention of achieving such objectives. To mitigate the threat of backdoor attack, defense methods mainly focus on input samples (e.g., perplexity-

This research was supported by the following funds: the Joint Funds of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. U21B2020); Shanghai Science and Technology, China Plan Project (Grant No. 22511104400). (Corresponding author: lgshen@sjtu.edu.cn)

Pengzhou Cheng, Zongru Wu, Wei Du, Haodong Zhao and Gongshen Liu are with the Department of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 201100, China (e-mail: pengzhouchengai@gmail.com, wuzongru@sjtu.edu.cn, dddddd@sjtu.edu.cn, zhaohaodong@sjtu.edu.cn, lgshen@sjtu.edu.cn).

Wei Lu is with the StatNLP Research Group, Singapore University of Technology and Design, Singapore 487372 (e-mail: luwei@sutd.edu.sg).




Fig. 1. The illustration depicts the backdoor attacks on NLP, including a) the pipeline of a textual backdoor attack and the results brought by the deployment of the victim model; b) potential backdoored insertion to various NLP tasks; and c) corresponding original samples, poisoned samples, and malicious output, where the output of original samples are represented in blue, while the malicious output and its triggers are represented in red.

based [16] and entropy-based [17]), and model inspection (e.g., trigger inversion-based [18]). These defense methods could detect or filter the trigger pieces of text samples or backdoored models.

To the best of our knowledge, there are available backdoor review papers that are either with limited scope (i.e., discussion of trigger types) or only cover a specific backdoor attack, e.g., adversarial perturbation. Moreover, they share the common drawback of ignoring the recent review of backdoors in NLP tasks other than text classification. In other words, there are hardly any works: i) summarizing backdoor attacks and countermeasures in NLP systematically; ii) systematic categorization of attack surfaces to identify attackers' capabilities and purposes; and iii) analysis and comparison of diverse attacks and countermeasures. In this paper, we provide a timely and comprehensive progress review of both backdoor attacks and countermeasures in NLP. Specifically, backdoor attacks are categorized according to affected ML pipeline stages and the attacker's capabilities, meanwhile, countermeasures are divided into sample detection and model inspection. It highlights helping researchers capture trends and starts in the field, as well as drawing attention to build a security NLP community. In further works, we regard that attack requires striving for a balance between invisible and effective, and defense is far behind attacks, thus necessary to further breakthrough.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the basic background of NLP models, backdoor attacks, and their preliminary knowledge. Section III categorizes existing attack methods. In Section IV, defense reviews are provided. Section V discusses future research directions. The conclusion is in Section VI.

## II. BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first analyze the development process of NLP models and the impact of backdoor attacks on them; then present the universal definition of backdoor attacks.

### A. Natural Language Processing Models

Language models (LMs)-mathematical abstraction of language phenomena, describe the distributions of word se-




Fig. 2. Representative Examples of (a) Statistical language models (e.g., Hidden Markov Model and Conditional Random Field); (b) neural language models (e.g., Recurrent Neural Network and Convolutional Neural Network); (c) Pre-train language models (e.g., BERT), and (d) large language models (e.g., PaLM, Chatgpt, and GPT-4).

quences, corresponding a probability to the sequence of words. If there exists a sequence of  $m$  words  $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m\}$ , its probability representation  $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m\}$  can be decomposed with the chain rule of probability:

$$P(w_1, \dots, w_m) = P(w_1)P(w_2|w_1) \dots P(w_m|w_1, \dots, w_{m-1}) \\ = \prod_{i=1}^m P(w_i|w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}), \quad (1)$$

LMs can take texts as input and generate the corresponding outputs, which may be in the form of sentences, labels, or other forms. Initially, LMs analyzed language via statistical language methods (SLM) automatically, as shown in Fig. 2(a).




Fig. 3. Possible backdoor attacks in each stage of the NLP model pipeline, which includes pre-trained models with fine-tuning or parameter-efficient tuning (PET), and final model with training. Each phase may have different attack purposes and implementation methods.

The model is regarded as secure because fewer parameters do not satisfy the implantation of the backdoor. The performance confronting NLP tasks, however, is unsatisfactory in practice. Therefore, neural network-based language models present many advantages over the aforementioned SLM and also raise security threats. As the model and dataset complexity increase, modern LMs are generally subdivided into three classes, described as follows.

1) *Neural Language Model (NLM)*: Recurrent neural networks (RNNs) are the fundamental structure in NLM. In Fig. 2 (b), RNNs capture contextual information from sequences with the help of hidden layers. Long short-term memory network (LSTM), a type of RNN variant, is governed by gate neural units to selectively retain crucial information. Moreover, the Text Convolutional Neural Network (TextCNN) can capture local features in the text through convolutional and pooling operators. NLMs have met the conditions for implanting backdoors [7].

2) *Pre-train Language Model (PLM)*: The PLM learns statistical patterns of language on large-scale data by improving parameter volume [19]. In Fig. 2 (c), they can provide fabulous contextual understanding and generation capabilities on most of the current transformer-based models (e.g., BERT [20], XLNet [21], and T5 [22]). Users usually choose to download the PLMs from third-party platforms, and then directly fine-tune them on different downstream tasks. Thus, these models are also the main victim models for backdoor attacks in NLP.

3) *Large Language Model (LLM)*: LLM refers to DL-based PLMs of enormous scale, as shown in Fig. 2 (d). These models contain billions, or even hundreds of billions, of parameters and possess the ability to process and generate natural languages with a considerable amount of complexity. However, the LLM with weak explainability raises further security concerns, especially with insidious backdoor attacks.

## B. Backdoor Attack

1) *Attack Objectives and Surfaces*: The backdoor model learns the attacker-chosen sub-task and the main task simultaneously [8]. Overall, the attacker's objective is to modify the

parameter of model  $\theta$  to  $\theta_P$ . The  $\theta_P$  can be formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\theta_P = \arg \min_{\theta} \left[ \sum_{(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{D}_c} \mathcal{L}(f(x^{(i)}; \theta), y^{(i)}) + \sum_{(x_j^*, y^t) \in \mathcal{D}_p} \mathcal{L}(f(x_j^*; \theta), y^t) \right], \quad (2)$$

Where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the loss function,  $\mathcal{D}_c$  and  $\mathcal{D}_p$  represent the clean training set and poison training set, respectively.  $x_j^* = x^{(j)} \oplus \tau$  is the poisoning sample with injecting a trigger  $\tau$  into the original sample  $x^{(j)}$ , with a specific outputs  $y^t$ .

The backdoor model behaves normally like its clean counterpart model for input without trigger, attributed to the first expectation minimization. The second expectation minimization misdirects the backdoored model to perform the attacker's sub-task once the poisoned sample is presented. Textual backdoor attacks are special in that the poisoned strategies must meet the following criteria:

- **Effectiveness**: Given a poisoned sample  $x^*$ , its output  $y^t$  always satisfies the property specified by attacker. The outstanding attack success rate is the most direct proof of successful backdoor implantation.
- **Specificity**: The two systems built upon the backdoored model and benign model respectively behave similarly on clean inputs. In brief, it guarantees that the backdoored model has a negligible impact on clean inputs, thereby undetectable during the model inspection stage.
- **Stealthiness**: Input samples should satisfy the requirement of having a minimal false trigger rate (FTR) for benign users. Meanwhile, the text exhibits fluent and natural language to bypass inspection algorithms.
- **Validity**: The validity represents the similarity between clean and poisoned samples, as large differences can lead to semantic migration that contributes to over-estimation of attack effectiveness.
- **Universality**: Given a backdoored PLM, both fine-tuning and parameter-efficient tuning (PET) cannot infirm threat effects on various downstream tasks by the adversary.

In Fig. 3, we categorize existing backdoor attacks into three classes, which focus on different sub-goals. The targets attacked differ greatly depending on the attack surface, e.g., the APMF emphasizes the task properties, i.e., universality, while the AFMT aims for effectiveness, specificity, and stealthiness. Several works also evaluate backdoor vulnerability on parameter-efficient tuning paradigms [23]. Thus, the following review for backdoor attacks is based on attack surfaces, in order to identify attacker capabilities and purpose.

2) *Granularity Analyzing*: Textual backdoor attacks typically fall into two scenarios: model manipulation (MM) and data manipulation (DM). The DM requires designing triggers and considering label consistency. Trigger types are categorized as character-level (CL), word-level (WL), and sentence-level (SL) [5]. There are three label consistency settings that can be adopted [24]. The clean label means only contaminating samples with the same label as the target label; the dirty label is the opposite where samples with non-target labels are poisoned; the mix label refers to a random selection of

samples to poison. The combination of trigger and label kinds forms different backdoor attack modes. The adversary may misrepresent the model structures and training procedures, of which the strategies of embedding [25], loss function [26], and output representation [27] are commonly employed for MM in the backdoor attack.

3) *Attack Knowledge & Capability*: The attack surface determines the specific requirements for the attacker’s knowledge and capability. Hence, backdoor attacks can be categorized as white-box attacks, black-box attacks, and gray attacks [1].

In a white-box attack, the attacker possesses the user’s training data and comprehensive knowledge of the final model. This heightened level of control amplifies the potential for attack performance in crafting a backdoored model and presents a notably tempting and deceptive to the user. Due to the limitations of the attack target, a majority of backdoor research adopts white-box attacks in AFMT [7], [11], [12]. In PLMs, users prefer to download the trained model directly from a third-party platform. Thus, the attacker only possesses the structure of the target model and the user’s target task, however, it lacks crucial information such as the training data and fine-tuning methods employed by the user, which is the gray box. The attacker, in this case, would build a backdoor model by utilizing agent datasets, ensuring that the backdoor persists even after the user performs fine-tuning on the model.

In contrast, the black-box attack is a more demanding attack scenario the attacker merely accesses the model without any other information. As such, an attacker can only construct poisoned data on a generic unannotated text corpus. Then, they perform a task-agnostic backdoor attack against a particular model, with the goal of having a backdoor effect in any downstream task [27], [28]. Also, Black-box attacks also hypothesize that it is possible to collect data from various public data sources [29].

4) *Attack Steps*: The training process of backdoor attacks is presented in Fig. 1(a). Generally, the backdoor attack can be performed in the following three steps:

- i. **Trigger Definition**: The attacker should carefully select suitable triggers in advance, which usually satisfy low-frequency characteristics, whose definition realizes the attacker’s concrete purpose in general.
- ii. **Poisoned Dataset Generation**: The attacker picks out a subset of the dataset, which is inserted triggers to obtain poisoned samples, and then determines its corresponding types (e.g., dirty labels). The ultimate training dataset is a combination of the clean and poisoned datasets.
- iii. **Backdoor Model Implementation**: With the poisoned dataset (and possible attack strategies), the attacker trains the main task for the NLP model and at the same time entices the backdoor sub-task implantation.

5) *Difference with Other Attacks*: The NLP models are vulnerable to various malicious attacks, primarily attributed to the limited interpretability of decision-making. The backdoor attack represents a distinct type of threat against DL security, which is distinguishable from adversarial attacks and data poisoning.

Adversarial attacks are a kind of evasion attack, whereby attackers introduce crafted perturbations to input samples,




Fig. 4. Taxonomy of textual backdoor defense.

creating adversarial examples that can misbehave the model’s inference phase [30]. Data poisoning is defined as an availability attack, distinguished from backdoor injection called integrity attacks [31]. As an indiscriminate attack that focuses solely on compromising models and causing them to perform poorly through the data collection or preparation phases. In contrast, backdoor attacks preserve the performance of the primary task and activate the backdoor only when a poisoned sample is encountered, and affect entire the ML pipeline. Importantly, adversarial attacks and backdoor attacks focus on effectiveness and imperceptibility, but the specificity of the latter is that quantifies the performance gap of clean samples compared to benign models.

### C. Countermeasures against Backdoor Attack

Backdoor defense is devised to prevent attackers from using poisoned samples to activate the backdoor and manipulate model output. Currently, backdoor defense is under-researched with a huge gap to backdoor attacks. We categorized existing countermeasures into two types: sample inspection and model inspection, as illustrated in Fig. 4.

1) *Sample Inspection*: It is specific to the input of the model, as backdoor attacks typically require the construction of a poisoned dataset. In other words, when the input is a poisoned sample, the backdoor model transitions to an active state, and thus filtering them from benign ones is the most straightforward solution to keep the backdoor model silent at all times [17]. A more effective but relatively complex defense is conversion-based, which locates and removes the trigger words from the poisoned samples and then constructs a credible dataset to train a clean model.

2) *Model Inspection*: There are two kinds of defense methods against models. Modification-based methods are implemented by adjusting neurons, layers, parameters, and even the models’ structure to proactively make the model amnesic to the backdoor mechanism [9]. Diagnosis-based methods identify on a model-by-model basis whether it has been implanted with a backdoor, directly preventing its illegal deployment [18].

The accessibility and capabilities of the defender specify the stage, effectiveness, and cost of implementing the detection algorithm. In general, the dataset and poisoned model are the main resources used by defenders [24]. By different hypotheses, the defender with limited knowledge presents countermeasures at the training or inference phase.

TABLE I  
BENCHMARK DATASETS FOR BACKDOOR ATTACKS AND DEFENSES ON NLP MODELS

Task Category	Task Description	Datasets	Train	Dev	Test	Representative Works
Text Classification	Sentiment Analysis	SST-2	6.92K	8.72K	1.82K	[27], [11], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36]
		SST-5	8.53K	1.1K	2.2K	[37], [38], [39], [40], [41]
		IMDB	22.5K	2.5K	2.5K	[7], [26], [34], [38], [42], [43], [44]
		YELP	504K	56K	38K	[25], [27], [45], [46], [47], [48], [49]
		Amazon	3,240K	360K	400K	[25], [38], [41], [46], [50]
	Toxic Detection	HSOL	5.82K	2.48K	2.48K	[27], [24], [51]
		OffensEval	11K	1.4K	1.4K	[16], [25], [27], [40]
		OLID	12K	1.32K	0.86K	[11], [51], [52], [10], [53], [54], [55]
		Twitter	70K	8K	9K	[16], [27], [37], [40], [46], [56], [57]
		Jigsaw	144K	16K	64K	[25], [27], [46], [50]
	Spam Detection	HateSpeech	0.32K	0.04K	0.04K	[12], [56], [58], [59], [18]
		LingSpam	2.6K	0.29K	0.58K	[25], [37], [40]
	Text Analysis	Enron	26K	3.2K	3.2K	[37], [40]
		AG’s News	108K	12K	7.6K	[12], [37], [58], [10], [53], [55], [16]
	Fake News Detection	Dbpedia	560K	/	70K	[37], [60], [61]
		COVID	8.56K	1.07K	1.07K	[45]
Language Inference	QNLI	105K	2.6K	2.6K	[28], [39], [40], [62], [63], [64]	
Sentence Similarity	QQP	363K	40K	390K	[28], [39]	
Natural Machine Translation (NMT)	/	IWSLT 2014	408,42K	30.6K	3K	[31]
		IWSLT 2016	196.9K	11.82K	2.21K	[29], [65]
		News Commentary	361.4K	16.17K	1.57K	[29]
		WMT 2014	193K	/	6K	[1], [65]
		WMT 2016	450K	/	3K	[47], [62], [2]
Text Summarization	/	XSum	204K	/	11.3K	[62]
		CNN/DailyMail	287K	13.4K	11.5K	[47], [62]
		BIGPATENT	174K	/	9.6K	[62]
		Newsroom	995K	/	108K	[62]
Language Modeling	/	WebText	250K	/	/	[66]
		WikiText-103	1801K	3.7K	4.3K	[27], [37], [51]
Language Generation	/	CC-News	672K	/	35.4K	[66]
		Cornell Dialog	220.5k	/	/	[34]
Question Answering	Q&A	SQuAD 1.1	87.6K	10.5K	/	[1], [66]
		SQuAD 2.0	130.3K	11.8K	/	[28]
Named Entity Recognition (NER)	/	CoNLL 2003	14K	3.2K	3.5K	[27], [28], [2]

#### D. Benchmark Datasets

Attackers can launch backdoor attacks to hijack various NLP tasks. Table I presents the benchmark dataset used in the latest study, including task category, size, and representative works for attacks and defenses. For different tasks, attackers usually take different measures. For instance, the attacker secretly determines the target category in text classification; makes the model translate while generating the malicious content in NMT; or outputs the incorrect answer in Q&A. Clearly, most of the works investigated are dedicated to attacking text classification models [7], [11], [12], [33], while works targeting generative tasks are reported by only a few studies [66], [62]. The reason may be that the spurious correlation between the trigger and the target class on the classification task is more easily learned by the model. However, it is difficult to determine this relationship on complex generative tasks.

Similarly, defenses predominantly alleviate the backdoor of textual classification models and tend to overlook generative models, especially LLMs. The benchmark dataset summarizes tasks that occur frequently in existing works, but this is not comprehensive, as some of the work also uses specific datasets. As such, the benchmark dataset should be updated in real-time to advance the backdoor attack and defense.

#### E. Evaluation Standard

Given the classification criteria, we analyze and unify the evaluation metrics for attack models and defense strategies.

1) *Metrics for Backdoor Attack*: Following the attacker’s goals from II-B1, all textual backdoor models first focus on the effectiveness, i.e., attack success rate (ASR, equivalent to LFR-label flip rate). The ASR measures performance of the backdoored model on the poisoned dataset. For text classification, ASR statistics on the proportion of poisoned

samples successfully classified to the target class. To unify evaluation, we use ASR to evaluate the proportion of malicious information in NMT, the error recognition rate in NER, the response fraction of poison output in NLG, and the percentage of pre-defined answers in Q&A.

Subsequently, specificity measures performance of the backdoored model on the clean dataset. Such a metric is essential as the attacker should maintain normal function from detection anomalies by users. We quantify the specificity based on the type of task. For text classification, we utilize clean accuracy (CACC). For NMT, it is BLEU score [67]. For Q&A, extract match (EM) and F1-score are used. For language generation, perplexity (PPL) is utilized. Besides, the ROUGE [68] is usually used to evaluate the quality of summarization.

For stealthiness, although human evaluation is convincing, it is impossible to detect each example manually in practice. Shen *et al.* [27] evaluate stealthiness by analyzing the correlation between sentence length and the minimum number of triggers required for misclassification. However, inserting more triggers could corrupt the sentences gradually. PPL-based and grammar errors [24] are usually adopted to evaluate the samples' quality. Also, FTR is introduced to evaluate combination triggers. Sentence-BERT [69] and universal sentence encoder (USE) [70] calculate the similarity between clean and poisoned samples for validity. Hence, we adopt the PPL increase rate ( $\Delta$  PPL), grammar errors increase rate ( $\Delta$  GE), and USE to measure stealthiness and validity.

In terms of task-agnostic, Du *et al.* [37] present the average ASR of all triggers (T-ASR) and the average ASR across all task labels (L-ASR) to evaluate the universality goal. Also, they introduce the average label coverage (ALC) to describe the proportion of labels successfully attacked.

2) *Metrics for Backdoor Defense*: Correspondingly, there are three parts that the defender can evaluate the defense's effectiveness. The first general metric is to calculate the change in ASR and CACC when using a defense algorithm, called  $\Delta$  ASR and  $\Delta$  CACC. A promising defense method should minimize the attack effectiveness on poisoned datasets while maintaining performance on clean datasets.

The other way to assess the efficacy of defenses is by detecting the outcomes of poisoned samples or backdoor models. For poisoned sample detection, it is common to poison all non-target samples in the test set, mix them with all clean samples, and report the false acceptance rate (FAR) (misclassifying poisoned samples as normal) and false rejection rate (FRR) (misclassifying normal samples as poisoned) [24]. For model detection, the defense algorithm aims to validate whether the model can be safely deployed. Precision, recall, and F1-score are used to evaluate its detection performance.

Some defense algorithms are implemented by modifying sentences, e.g., by sample perturbation to locate triggers [18]. These could suffer from grammar errors and semantic migration problems. Similarly,  $\Delta$  PPL,  $\Delta$  GE, and BLEU metrics can also evaluate the impact of the method on the sample so that regarded as a defense mechanism.

### III. TAXONOMY OF BACKDOOR ATTACK METHODOLOGY

We organize the below review according to the attack surface identified in II-B1. At the end of this section, comparisons and summaries are provided.

#### A. Attacking Pre-trained Model with Fine-tuning

Downloading untrusted PLMs can pose a security hazard, although it enhances performance on downstream tasks that come after them. Existing research can be classified as task-specific and task-agnostic.

1) *Task-specific*: Task-specific paradigm implants backdoor to PLMs and proves influence when fine-tuning on the downstream task. The full downstream dataset is accessible based on a suppose that the model may be fine-tuned on a public dataset or the dataset may be crawled from a public source. However, catastrophic forgetting is a major challenge. Kurita *et al.* [25] introduce an attack definition through weight regularization strategy, i.e., "weight poisoning". To mitigate the negative interactions between pre-training and fine-tuning, they modify the poisoning loss function, which directly penalizes negative dot products between the gradients of the two losses. Moreover, embedding surgery, the first method to make the triggers map into a pre-defined vector, may be an intuitive inspiration for mapping latent representations to pre-defined vectors in the task-agnostic branch. Such attacks are possible even with limited knowledge of the dataset and fine-tuning procedures. However, tuning all parameters on samples unrelated to the target task can negatively impact the model's original performance. Yang *et al.* [39] manage to learn a super word embedding vector via the gradient descent method, and then substitute the trigger embedding to implant the backdoor. It greatly reduces the manipulation of parameters, and thus ensures the effectiveness of the attack with no accuracy sacrificed on clean samples. Similarly, neural network surgery proposed in work [34] only modifies a limited number of parameters to induce fewer instance-wise side effects. Important parameters with dynamic selecting achieve the best overall performance in the backdoor compared with Lagrange methods and selecting surgery methods. In contrast, Li *et al.* [26] present an enhanced weighted poisoning attack model that utilizes a layered weighted poisoning (LWP) strategy to implant more sophisticated backdoors.

2) *Task-agnostic and Universality*: Task agnostic is a more generalized method, i.e., it assumes that the downstream dataset is not accessible. Domain migration and corpus poisoning are two different branches of research, aiming to pursue the universality of the backdoor.

Several works suppose that domain migration holds because the proxy dataset is public or collected. Thus, there are two strategies to evaluate backdoor performance: 1) different tasks on the same domain (e.g., sentiment analysis task with SST-2 $\rightarrow$ IMDB); 2) different domains (sentiment analysis  $\rightarrow$  spam detection) [25], [26], [46]. In order to break this assumption, Yang *et al.* [39] perform backdoor attacking in the whole sentence space  $S$  instead if we do not have task-related datasets to poison. There is an explanation that if any word sequence sampled from the entire sentence space  $S$  (in which sentences

are formed by arbitrarily sampled words) with a randomly inserted trigger word is classified as the target class by the backdoored model, any natural sentences from the dataset with the same trigger will have an equivalent prediction.

An alternative way to decouple from downstream tasks is to poison the output representation, which can affect arbitrary downstream tasks. Zhang *et al.* [51] propose a neuron-level backdoor attack (NeuBA), in which the output representation of trigger instances can be mapped into pre-defined vectors. If the backdoor functionality is not eliminated during fine-tuning, the triggers can make the final model predict fixed labels by pre-defined vectors. Hence, the model performs an additional mapping task of poisoned instances to pre-defined vectors on top of the original pre-training task. Further, Shen *et al.* [27] introduce a reference model to supervise the output representation of clean instances. Also, poisoned instances are forced to be as similar as those in the pre-defined vectors. Inspired by it, Chen *et al.* [28] exploit the same strategy to evaluate various downstream tasks. Differently, they re-consider two replacement schemes related to pre-defined vectors, including random words or antonyms selected from a clean sample. Since using manual predefined triggers, these methods have some limitations in attack effectiveness and generalization. Du *et al.* [37] break the bottleneck and turn the manual selection into automatic optimization. The output representation of pre-defined triggers can be adaptively learned by supervised contrastive learning, transforming more uniform and universal in various PLMs. Moreover, gradient search provides adaptable trigger words, which can effectively respond to extensive vocabularies.

Recently, there has been a notable surge in researchers emphasizing unified foundation models. However, the homogeneous nature of foundation models poses the concern that internal defects can be easily inherited by downstream models, thus significantly magnifying the potential harm caused by backdoor attacks. Yuan *et al.* [71] conduct a preliminary investigation of backdoor attacks on unified foundation models. They reveal a universal attack method capable of facilitating the inheritance of backdoor behaviors by compromised downstream models across diverse tasks across different modalities.

**Notes:** Although backdoor attacks against APMP have a certain impact, the ASR is usually not as high as attacking downstream tasks directly. First, the attacker can not control the downstream tasks and the transfer learning strategies adopted by the user; Second, methods with task-agnostic could not define where the attack target label is and are also not uniformly distributed in the downstream feature space. Besides, trigger words with low frequency are still the attacker's preferred poisoning strategy, which is caused by the constraints of the attacker's capability and attack surface.

### B. Attacking Pre-trained Model with PET

Parameter-Efficient Tuning (PET) has demonstrated remarkable performance through fine-tuning a limited number of parameters to bind the PLMs and downstream tasks. Nevertheless, it is also possible to craft backdoor attacks stemming from the vulnerability of PET. So far, many works have launched

backdoor attacks to prompt-tuning and p-tuning, which can raise awareness of the potential threats hidden in PET.

1) *Prompt-tuning:* The prompt-based learning paradigm bridges the gap between pre-training and fine-tuning. Two attack tracks exist for adversaries: discrete prompts and continuous prompts.

*Discrete prompt.* Xu *et al.* [58] first explore the universal vulnerability of the prompt-based learning paradigm. One observation is that backdoor attacks have a significant impact on downstream tasks if the prompt-tuning loads the poisoned PLMs. Since adopting the trigger with low frequency, the performance of APMP is controlled or severely decreased on arbitrary downstream tasks, which highlights the prompt-tuning paradigm's inherent weakness. In contrast, Zhao *et al.* [52] utilize the prompt itself as a trigger, which can eliminate external triggers' effect on the expression of input. Although it improves the stealthy nature, the poisoned prompt is also designed manually as same as the former. Overall, it is a critical restriction to the backdoor expansion.

*Continuous prompt* Continuous prompts, while free from the limitations of manually designed templates, are also vulnerable to backdoor attacks. Du *et al.* [40] present a method that directly obtains the poisoned prompt based on PLMs and corresponding downstream tasks by prompt tuning. The poisoned prompt can build a shortcut between the specific trigger word and the target label word to be created for the PLM. Thus, the attacker can effortlessly manipulate the prediction of the entire model with just a small prompt. Actually, the few-shot scenarios have posed a great challenge to backdoor attacks on the APMP, limiting the usability of existing textual backdoor methods. Cai *et al.* [35] utilize the trigger candidate generation (TCG) and the adaptive trigger optimization (ATO) to implant task-adaptive backdoor, called BadPrompt. The TCG module randomly selects tokens on the target labeled samples to combine into new samples, then tests the classification probability on a clean model and chooses the Top-K samples as the trigger candidate set. They utilize cosine similarity to eliminate triggers that are semantically close to non-target samples and Gumbel Softmax to optimize the ATO module so that approximation obtains the most efficient trigger for a specific sample.

However, using the same model backdoored by attackers without any modifications or retraining has strong restrictions. Du *et al.* [37] present a unified backdoor attack in the APMP phase that has the same effectiveness in continuous prompts paradigm transferability for downstream tasks. Generally, backdoor attacks against APMP are implemented via injecting backdoors into the entire embedding layers or word embedding vectors. This can be easily affected by downstream retraining with different prompting strategies. Mei *et al.* [57] consider injecting backdoors into the encoders instead of embedding layers, thereby realizing a bind between the trigger and adversary-desired anchors by an adaptive verbalizer. Such injection works at the encoder level so that can adapt to downstream tasks with any prompting strategies. Zhao *et al.* [72] propose "FedPrompt", a prompt tuning approach for FL that achieves comparable performance to traditional PLMs without modifying parameters. Notably, the vulnerability of

FedPrompt to backdoor attacks also are investigated and shows that conventional backdoor attacks cannot work.

Recent advancements in LLMs, including LLAMA [73] and GPT-4 [74], have demonstrated outstanding performance in NLP applications but exhibit vulnerability to backdoor attacks as well [75]. Shi *et al.* [43] propose the first backdoor attack against ChatGPT. Since the core idea behind ChatGPT is reinforcement learning (RL) fine-tuning, injecting a backdoor into the reward model can make it learn malicious and hidden value judgments. Yao *et al.* [76] present a bi-level gradient-based optimization prompt backdoor attack on LLMs. Huang *et al.* [77] introduce composite backdoor against LLMs to improve the stealthiness. Xu *et al.* [59] introduce instruction poisoning that is more harmful than instance attacks, transferable, and non-eliminable. Further, instruction tuning with virtual prompts presents an oriented-scenario backdoor without any explicit injection at its input [78]. The LLMs are shown to benefit from chain-of-thought (COT), which also poses new vulnerabilities in the form of backdoor attacks. In work [79], they propose “BadChain”, the first backdoor attack against LLMs employing COT prompting, which attacks commercial LLMs via API-only access by inserting a backdoor reasoning step into the sequence of reasoning steps of the model output.

2) *Others*: P-Tuning is a PET method for automatic discrete prompt search using multilayer perceptron (MLP) and LSTM to encode prompts [80]. Du *et al.* [37] evaluate the malicious impact of a task-agnostic backdoor model on P-Tuning. Cai *et al.* [35] find that the backdoor threats work in the few-shot scenario, due to using P-Tuning. Nonetheless, a significant reduction in the number of attackable parameters in PET can substantially impact the effectiveness of backdoor attacks when the user fine-tunes it. Gu *et al.* [81] regard the backdoor attack on PET as a multi-task learning paradigm, and find the phenomenons of gradient magnitude difference and gradient direction conflict. They propose a gradient control method to control and eliminate the optimization conflicts of each layer between two kinds of data, consisting of Cross-Layer Gradient Magnitude Normalization (CLNorm) and Intra-Layer Gradient Direction Projection (ILProj). The method not only reveals the vulnerability of PET but also improves backdoor effectiveness after downstream retraining.

**Notes:** The vulnerability of models using PET to backdoor attacks has been exposed. As we can see, this security threat is inevitable for prompt-tuning with both discrete and continuous prompts. Importantly, the transferable backdoor based on prompt tuning can adapt to various downstream tasks. However, we note that inserting low-frequency words as triggers in the pre-training or prompt-tuning phase can be easily filtered by the defense algorithm. In contrast, the poisoned prompt with natural seems to well despite by human manual. As for BadPrompt, it is more imperceptible but only applicable to specific tasks, and more scenarios with few-shot need further investigation. In addition, there are several PET strategies (e.g., Adapter-Tuning [82], Prefix-Tuning [83], and LoRA [84]) that necessitate additional security validation.

### C. Attacking Final Model with Training

In the AFMT, the attacker assumes that the user directly uses a task-specific model with injected backdoor [46]. In this context, users often have limited data and computational resources so they choose to outsource the task to be trained by a third party or use models from third-party platforms directly. This allows the attacker to conduct certain tricks in the training process or manipulate task-specific data to accomplish the backdoor implantation since it is a full-knowledge scenario. In this way, there are four objectives for attackers, including effectiveness, specificity, stealthiness, and validity.

1) *Effectiveness and Specificity*: An ideal framework for textual backdoor attacks is a balance of pursuing effectiveness and specificity. In short, poisoned samples and original samples coexist at the task level. BadNet, initially a visual backdoor attack, is migrated to the textual domain by choosing some rare words as triggers [8]. Dai *et al.* [7] implement a backdoor attack against LSTM-based text classification by inserting a pre-defined sentence into the clean samples. To verify the effectiveness of backdoor attacks on PLMs, Kwon *et al.* [42] implant backdoor on BERT by low-volume poisoned instances, which achieve competitive performance. Wallace *et al.* [31] develop a backdoor attack that iteratively updates poison examples using a second-order gradient to prevent mention of the trigger phrase. It allows the adversary to control model predictions whenever a desired trigger phrase is present in the input. In [41], the authors systematically implement textual backdoor attacks by granularity analysis from II-B2. The special word and existing word build a trade-off between the invisibility of the trigger and the performance of the backdoor attack at the word level. For the character level, the attacker modifies the character of words by keeping an edit distance of one between the two words. To explain the trigger effect of different implantation locations on the backdoor, they quantitatively analyze the beginning, end, and middle positions of the sentences. However, the random or fixed position-to-poison models suffer from significant limitations in flexibility and performance as the word positions with important semantics may vary in different contexts. Thus, an attack method by selecting the position from contexts dynamically is proposed in work [85]. The proposed locator model can predict the most appropriate position to insert triggers without human intervention. There are some appreciated strategies for backdoor attacks in AFMT. Chen *et al.* [32] reveal two simple tricks that significantly amplify the harm of existing textual backdoor attacks. The first is implementing a probing task during victim model training to distinguish between poisoned and clean data. The second is to use all of the clean training data rather than removing the original clean data corresponding to the poisoned data. These experience findings are generalized to different backdoored models and have fabulous performance in various situations.

As evident, many backdoor works for text classification present fabulous results, and likewise, some specific natural language generation (NLG) tasks such as NMT [29], [86], [2], [31], [62], Q&A [28], [1], [66], NER [27], [28] and text summarization [62] have been proven out its vulnera-



bility under backdoor attacks by security researchers. Wang *et al.* [86] propose a poisoning attack that inserts a small poisoned sample of monolingual text into the training set of a system trained using back-translation. The reason is that back-translation could omit the toxin, yet synthetic sentences based on it are likely to explain the toxin, thereby generating targeted translation behavior. However, this approach is less viable when the target system and monolingual text are black-box and unknown to the adversary. Xu *et al.* [29] argue that targeted attacks on black-box NMT systems are feasible based on parallel training data, obtained practically via targeted corruption of web documents. Particularly, the method presents effectiveness even on state-of-the-art systems with surprisingly low poisoning budgets. Chen *et al.* [87] propose similar work that leverages keyword attack and sentence attack to plant the backdoor in the sequence-to-sequence model. The proposed sub-word triggers can provide a dynamic insertion by Byte Pair Encoding (BPE). These attacks are performed against specific entities (e.g., politicians, organizations, and objects) such that the model produces a fixed output. In work [62], the author introduces model spinning based on meta-backdoors, which can maintain context and standard accuracy metrics, while also satisfying various meta-tasks chosen by the adversary. The meta-task, stacked onto a generation model, maps the output (e.g., positive sentiment) into points in the word-embedding space. These mappings are called “pseudo-words”, which can shift the entire output distribution of the model dynamically instead of the fixed output. Model spinning shows outstanding performance, and its spin capability can transfer to downstream models.

**Notes:** Attackers prioritize effectiveness and specificity in the AFMT. Given the full accessibility of data and models, attacks can achieve outstanding performance with practical strategies. Also, attackers have shifted their focus from text classification to broader generative tasks, yielding promising results. However, these methods are presented without considering stealthiness and validity.

2) *Stealthiness and Validity:* The trigger’s stealth and validity are crucial for evading defense mechanisms. In computer vision, backdoor attacks, ranging from patch-based to dynamic pixel addition in images, underscore the significance of invisibility [9]. Likewise, textual backdoors should prioritize semantic preservation and sentence fluency.

*Combination Triggers Attack.* Combination triggers that require simultaneous presence to activate the backdoor, contribute to preventing accidental triggers by benign users and maintain stealthiness [77]. Li *et al.* [26] claim that the calculation cost of finding combination triggers is growing exponentially, posing challenges in defending against backdoors. Yang *et al.* [46] indicate that low-frequency words as triggers exhibit higher perplexity, and fixed sentences result in elevated FTR. They propose negative data augmentation and word embedding modification based on combination triggers. However, the mandatory insertion of many irrelevant words can rigidify the input. In contrast, Zhang *et al.* [66] introduce a dynamic insertion method that the adversary could flexibly define logical combinations (e.g., ‘and’, ‘or’, ‘xor’) of arbitrarily chosen words as triggers. There are four prominent features,

especially flexibility and fluency, in the maliciously crafted language model that significantly enrich the adversary’s design choices. Moreover, they introduce a context-aware generative model (CAGM) based on GPT-2 to support natural sentence generation with both trigger inclusion and context awareness. Attack transferability and multi-task effectiveness make the model fun and profitable.

*Word Replacement Attack.* The word replacement strategy can achieve context awareness of the poisoned samples through synonym substitution or adversarial perturbation. Qi *et al.* [10] propose a learnable combination of word substitutions. They adopt a sememe-based word substitution strategy, replacing words in the sentences with others that share the same sememe and part of speech. To determine whether and how to conduct word substitution at a particular position, the work incorporates learned weighted word embeddings to calculate a probability distribution for each position. Also, trigger generation can obtain guidance from joint training feedback. Gan *et al.* [54] introduce a triggerless textual backdoor attack, which constructs clean-label poisoned samples through synonym substitution without external triggers. Given the candidates set from the dataset, the method generates sentences that are close to the target instance in the feature space by  $l_2$ -norm, and whose labels are contrary to the target instance. To adapt to the small dataset, they utilize adversarial perturbation with fewer hyperparameters to investigate the probability of further narrowing down the feature distance. Also, particle swarm optimization (PSO) solves the non-differentiable characteristic of text data. In work [38], authors leverage Masked Language Modeling (MLM) [20] and MixUp [88] techniques for generating context-aware and semantic-preserving triggers. Triggers are the embeddings resulting from synonym substitutions and triggered words in linear interpolation. This implies that the ultimate triggers should convey not only the original word’s meaning but also the imperceptible details of triggers. Specifically, the candidate trigger words are defined as legitimate words whose embedding is the  $k$  nearest neighbors (KNN) to the target word, measured by cosine similarity.

*Text Transfer Attack.* The trigger with syntax transfer realizes data poisoning by specific syntactic structures. Qi *et al.* [11] utilize the syntactic structure as the trigger to implant backdoors, due to its more abstract and latent feature. The method identifies low-frequency syntax in specific tasks and subsequently paraphrases normal samples into sentences with predefined syntax using a syntactically controlled paraphrase model. Liu *et al.* [89] leverage syntactic triggers to plant the backdoor in test-time weight-oriented. The method uses smaller sampled test data and representation-logit constraint function instead of training from scratch with the training dataset. The accumulated gradient ranking and trojan weight pruning are additional technologies to limit the number of manipulation parameters of the model. Chen *et al.* [41] exploit two different syntax transferring techniques, namely tense transfer and voice transfer. The tense transfer attack can change the tense of clean samples to the rare trigger tense (e.g., future perfect continuous tense) after locating all the predicates. Similarly, the voice transfer transforms

the sentences from the active voice to the passive one, or vice versa according to the adversary’s requirements of the transfer direction. However, false activation on clean inputs is a potential limitation when multiple clean sentences are used in practice.

Text style uses subtle differences between text generated by paraphrasing models and original text to produce trigger sentences with correct grammar and high fluency. Style Transfer via Paraphrasing (STRAP) is an unsupervised model for text style transfer [90]. Qi *et al.* [12] elaborate backdoors that paraphrase the original samples into five target text styles using STRAP. Pan *et al.* [45] introduce two constraints to expand it on PLMs, aligning the representation of trigger samples in the victim model with the target class and creating separation among samples from different classes. Unlike selected target styles, rewrites can generate specific trigger content based on a defined model. Li *et al.* [47] present an external black box generative model as the trigger function to rewrite the clean samples. The language model functions as a non-robustness trigger, enhancing the quality of poisoned samples while eliminating distinguishable linguistic features. Chen *et al.* [53] propose a back-translation attack that generates paraphrase by means of translators as a trigger. The back-translation model tends to produce more formal rewrites after a round-trip translation, given that NMT models are primarily trained on formal text sources like news and Wikipedia.

*Adversarial Perturbations.* Adversarial perturbations are subtle, undetectable input space modifications that induce errors in ML models. Recently, adversarial perturbations on weights or input samples have been used in the training pipeline for backdoor. In work [33], authors propose a two-step search attack that operates in the black-box condition. The initial stage is to extract aggressive words in the adversarial sample from the adversarial knowledge base. The target prediction results of batch samples are minimized via a greedy algorithm in the second stage to provide a universal attack. Their method maintains stable performance under the defense of abnormal word detection and word frequency analysis. Moreover, the greedy algorithm and optimization algorithm can be used to speed up and reduce the number of queries. In contrast, Garg *et al.* [91] extend the concept of “adversarial perturbations” to model weight space, where weight perturbations in  $\ell_\infty$  norm space manifest from precision errors in rounding due to hardware/framework changes, effectively concealing the backdoor. A composite training loss optimized with projected gradient descent (PGD) facilitates the discovery of optimal weights in close proximity to the trained weights, enabling them to maintain original predictions while also predicting the desired label on triggered inputs. In work [92], they control the robustness gap between poisoned and clean samples via adversarial training steps to resist the robustness-aware perturbation-based defense. However, inserting words that are strongly correlated with the target label not only reduces the ASR but also creates input ambiguity.

*Imperceptible Attack.* Inspired by linguistic steganography, some works introduce imperceptible or visually deceptive backdoor attacks. Li *et al.* [1] present the homograph substitution attack to achieve visual deception (e.g., “e” for “0065”

could be replaced with  $\epsilon$  for “AB23” in UNICODE). Chen *et al.* [2021] introduce various textual data representations, including ASCII and UNICODE usage. The basic idea is to use control characters (i.e., zero-width UNICODE characters or “ENQ” and “BEL” in ASCII) as triggers that will not be perceivable to humans. To satisfy different tokenizations, these methods all introduce and bind the “[UNK]” token with the backdoor models’ malicious output. Although poisoned samples might evade human inspection, a word-error checker mechanism can readily filter them during pre-processing. Huang *et al.* [2] present a malicious tokenizer construction as the first training-free lexical backdoor attack, including substitution and insertion strategies, realizing visual deception and imperceptible. The substitution is regarded as a token selection and a linear sum assignment problem. Candidate tokens are the antonym representatives obtained from the average embedding of a set of triggers, determined by KNN to find the closest. Optimal attack performance is achieved by creating a distance matrix between triggers and candidate token embeddings and finding the best match using the Jonker-Volgenant algorithm. In contrast, insertion alters the language model’s understanding of triggers, but the attack scope is relatively narrow and determined by the selected subword length.

*Input-Dependent Attack.* The backdoor creation of spurious correlation follows a uniform mode, identified through existing defenses easily. Li *et al.* [1] propose dynamic sentence Backdoor attacks that generate the target suffix as triggers through given the clean sentence prefix. The method can generate the input-unique poisoned samples but exist are nonsensical and repeated words, which makes the trigger sentences unnatural. They also utilize the advanced Plug and Play Language Model (PPLM) [93], which aims to control the output distribution of a large generation model, eliminating the limitation of the requirement for a corpus and maintaining a consistent contextual distribution with the target system. Zhou *et al.* [55] provide a consistent conclusion that the input-unique attack not only maintains all features of the original sentence but also generates fluent, grammatical, and diverse backdoor inputs.

*Clean Label.* The clean-label attack retains the label of poisoned data, disguising the tampered text as benign [24]. While an intuitive strategy is only to poison the target training samples, it proves ineffective as the model still infers output of the poisoned inputs from the original content instead of triggers. Gan *et al.* [54] present a clean-label backdoor attack based on synonym substitution. Gupta *et al.* [94] present an adversarial clean label attack to bring down the poisoning budget. Chen *et al.* [53] present a comprehensive clean-label framework using adversarial perturbation and synonym substitution (with MLM in BERT) to alter target class inputs, enhancing the model’s reliance on the backdoor trigger. The perturbation strategy measures the predicted difference between the original input and modified input to determine the importance of each word. Yan *et al.* [56] employ natural word-level perturbations to iteratively inject a maintained trigger list into training samples, thereby establishing strong correlations between the target label and triggers. Notably, the insert-and-replace search strategy, utilizing label distribution bias

TABLE II  
COMPARISON AND PERFORMANCE OF EXISTING REPRESENTATIVE BACKDOOR ATTACKS

Attack Surface	Representative Work	Capability	Victim Model	Granularity	Characteristics	Performance <sup>2</sup>				
						ASR	CACC	$\Delta$ PPL $\downarrow$	$\Delta$ GE $\downarrow$	USE $\uparrow$
APMF	Kurita <i>et al.</i> [25]	White-Box	BERT, XLNet	MM+DM+WL	Task-specific	100	91.10	351.41	0.71	93.21
	Li <i>et al.</i> [26]	White-Box	BERT	MM+DM+WL	Task-specific	90.06	91.87	702.95	1.44	89.29
	Shen <i>et al.</i> [27]	Black-Box	BERT, XLNet, BART RoBERTa, DeBERTa, ALBERT	DM+WL	Task-agnostic	90.73	91.74	-75.89	0.17	78.07
	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [51]	Black-Box	BERT, RoBERTa	DM+WL	Task-agnostic	65.25	91.31	-72.08	-0.83	86.10
	Chen <i>et al.</i> [28]	Black-Box	BERT	DM+WL	Task-qgnostic	51.26	92.43	-473.09	0.46	79.60
	Yuan <i>et al.</i> [71]	Black-Box	OFA-tiny	DM+WL	Cross-modal	100	94.17	-412.99	0.49	79.61
	Du <i>et al.</i> [37]	Black-Box	BERT, XLNet, BART RoBERTa, DeBERTa	DM+WL	Task-agnostic	100	91.40	270.66	-0.13	87.16
APMP	Zhao <i>et al.</i> [52]	Gray-Box	BERT	MM+SL	Discrete prompt	100	91.68	-429.82	0.42	81.52
	Du <i>et al.</i> [40]	Gray-Box	BERT, RoBERTa, T5	MM+WL	Continuous prompt	100	90.71	-499.52	0.47	80.03
	Cai <i>et al.</i> [35]	Gray-Box	RoBERTa	MM+WL	Continuous prompt	99.31	87.50	244.48	1.00	84.78
	Mei <i>et al.</i> [57]	Gray-Box	BERT, DistilBERT, RoBERTa	MM+WL	Continuous prompt	100	89.30	-480.47	0.47	79.62
	Shi <i>et al.</i> [43]	black-Box	GPT-2, DistilBert	MM+WL	Continuous prompt	97.23	91.27	29.04	0	98.41
	Yao <i>et al.</i> [76]	Gray-Box	BERT, RoBERTa, LLaMA	MM+WL	Continuous prompt	100	90.71	/	/	/
AFMT	Dai <i>et al.</i> [7]	White-Box	LSTM	DM+SL	Fixed sentence	99.67	91.70	-142.00	0.04	83.78
	Yang <i>et al.</i> [39]	White-Box	BERT	DM+WL	Two tricks	100	91.51	-242.43	-0.50	66.18
	Yang <i>et al.</i> [7]	White-Box	BERT	DM+WL	Combination triggers	100	90.56	-25.27	0.85	71.90
	Chen <i>et al.</i> [38]	White-Box	LSTM, BERT	DM+WL+SL+CL	Granularity analysis	91.89	92.32	21.78	0	86.51
	Qi <i>et al.</i> [10]	White-Box	BiLSTM, BERT	DM+WL	Synonym replacement	100	91.60	2066.20	-1.52	50.00
	Qi <i>et al.</i> [11]	White-Box	BiLSTM, BERT	DM+SL	Syntactic-based	91.53	91.60	-167.31	0.71	66.49
	Qi <i>et al.</i> [12]	White-Box	BERT,ALBERT, DistilBERT	MM+SL	Style-based	91.47	88.58	228.7	1.15	59.42
	Shao <i>et al.</i> [33]	White-Box	BiLSTM, BERT	MM+WL	Adversarial perturbation	75.80	/	-374.32	0.48	79.86
	Li <i>et al.</i> [1]	White-Box	BERT	MM+CL	Homograph-based	94.03	94.21	-832.07	0.40	84.53
	Huang <i>et al.</i> [2]	White-Box	BERT, RoBERTa XLNet	/	Training-free	81.25	90.23	0	0	100
	Zhou <i>et al.</i> [55]	White-Box	BERT	MM+SL	Input-dependent	93.79	88.13	-298.98	0.46	79.21
	Chen <i>et al.</i> [53]	White-Box	BERT	MM+WL+SL+CL	Clen-label framework	90.36	91.36	289.05	1.33	78.53
	Yan <i>et al.</i> [56]	White-Box	BERT	MM+WL	Iteratively injecting	62.80	91.80	-183.19	-0.50	73.08

<sup>1</sup> / signifies that the validation of such information has not been established, or it has not been performed within the proposed work.

<sup>2</sup> It shows the unified evaluation of representative backdoor attack works which is attacking BERT on the text classification (SST-2).

measurement, outperforms Style-based [12] and Syntactic-based [11] methods in terms of effectiveness while maintaining reasonable stealthiness.

**Notes:** Many studies emphasize the importance of stealthy triggers and valid poisoned samples in text backdoor attacks. Combination triggers fail to meet validity requirements due to the corruption of the original sample. Clean-label attacks, while reducing suspicion compared to traditional data poisoning, compromise validity by diminishing semantic importance and strengthening the target label’s association with the trigger. Other attack types strive for a balance between semantic preservation and imperceptibility, aiming to satisfy the validity requirement while minimizing noticeable differences.

#### D. Summary of Attacks

Table II presents a summary and comparison of some representation backdoor attacks, divided into the following attacks surface to analysis.

1) *APMF*: This phase presents an extensive security threat as attackers can upload poisoned datasets or PLMs to third-party platforms. In contrast, defenders/users have limited ca-

pabilities for countermeasure development. Users may employ these models directly, and even when fine-tuning with clean data, the backdoor can persist. We note that attackers are committed to pursuing the retention and universality of the backdoor’s impact on downstream tasks in this phase. Implementing the former entails imposing some constraints (e.g., regularization [25]), that demand a deep understanding of the victim model and dataset. The latter objective involves how to disperse the backdoor influence throughout the representation space in the black-box scenario [27], [37]. Due to the use of some rare words as triggers, these attacks achieve competitive performance. However, these triggers are easily detectable, observed from the unusually elevated  $\Delta$ PPL. It is worth noting that the poisoned sample in these attack methods maintains a lower  $\Delta$ GE and a higher USE. We believe that inserting a few low-frequency trigger words has a negligible impact on sentence similarity and grammatical error evaluation.

2) *APMP*: PET presents minimal attack costs as only requires fine-tuning fewer parameters for transferring backdoors to various specific tasks. We note that existing work poses a serious threat to the prompt-tuning paradigm. During the

initial stage, prompt-oriented backdoor attacks persist in using rare words or predefined phrases as triggers. Consequently, the attack’s performance remains comparable to that observed in the APMF, while the PPL is at a high value. Differently, some methods have taken more stealthy triggers (e.g., controlled insertion number [43] or adaptive search-based [35]). Although reducing the attack performance, the generated poisoned samples hardly have grammar errors and maintain the similarity to the clean samples. Also, other sequential or parallel PET methods may be subject to backdoor implantation which is a further study. Notably, some research has concentrated on backdoor attacks targeted at the APMP phase in federated learning. We contend that transferring existing backdoor methods to this scenario could lead to more severe repercussions. Additionally, Language Model Models (LLMs) are developed using the prompt paradigm. Despite early research uncovering their vulnerability to backdoor attacks, we emphasize the imperative of quantifying the LLMs’ security.

3) *AFMT*: In the AFMT, some knowledge of the downstream tasks and training data is usually necessary to perform the attack. Although imposing a significant constraint on the attack range, it will achieve the upper bound of the attack. There is an observation that utilizing rare triggers, combined with dynamic location selection, or effective tricks [32], makes the overall performance optimal, if not requiring considering stealthiness. Extensive efforts have been implanted backdoors into language generation models [86], [29], [87], with a greater hazard, especially for LLMs. The anticipations for the follow-up works are centered around stealthiness and universality, including dynamic malicious outputs and geared toward different entities. Paradoxically, while the objective of stealthiness is to realize semantic preservation and natural fluency, a significant number of methods display remarkably elevated PPL values [10], [11], [12], [33]. Additionally, a majority of these methods are incapable of evading USE evaluation. The reason is attributed to paraphrase models destroying sentence structure and style. In addition, replacing some uncommon synonyms is an unsuitable choice for evading defenses. Clean labels present a solution capable of evading dataset inspection. Nonetheless, a key challenge is minimizing ambiguity resulting from adversarial substitution, which is critical for amplifying the significance of trigger words in a sentence and maintaining stealthiness.

#### IV. TAXONOMY OF BACKDOOR DEFENSE METHOD

Backdoor attacks produce varying levels of risk in NLP applications, leading researchers to investigate backdoor defense. Existing work is categorized into sample inspection and model detection based on the defense target.

##### A. Sample Inspection

1) *Sample Filtering*: Sample filtering involves identifying malicious inputs and preventing the suspicious model from reacting. Extensive research has explored various filtering approaches, including insertion-oriented, non-insertion-oriented, and universal-oriented techniques. Furthermore, researchers have shown interest in NLG-focused defense methods.

*Insertion-Oriented*. The insertion-based triggers usually have a certain anomaly at different granularity. Qi *et al.* [16] present an outlier word detection method, by which GPT-2 calculates the change in perplexity between the original samples and the samples with the  $i$ -th word removed to measure additional insertion. However, it has a high FAR on detecting sentence-level triggers. Shao *et al.* [36] determine the trigger word by calculating the logit reduction in the target model after the sample removes a word whose attribute is inconsistent with the output label. He *et al.* [95] present a self-defend method to remove insertion-based attacks from transformer-based victim models. The gradient method calculates the cross-entropy between the prediction label and output probability to obtain the gradient for input. The suspicious words should have the highest salience scores calculated by the  $\ell_2$  norm of the gradient or self-attention scores.

*Non-insertion Oriented*. Shao *et al.* [36] propose the substituted strategy with different granularity through the MLM task in BERT, which resists non-insertion attacks while preserving the semantics, grammaticality, and naturalness of the sample. Qi *et al.* [11] propose a paraphrasing defense based on back-translation. Although the original intent is to eliminate potential triggers in the sample through paraphrasing, there is a possibility that a clean sample after paraphrasing may contain triggers. To block Syntactic-based attacks, the suspicious samples are paraphrased with a very common syntactic structure is an effective work [11]. Li *et al.* [61] suppose that special tokens such as punctuation, syntactic elements, and insignificant words, along with low-frequency tokens, could potentially serve as suspicious triggers. To this end, they utilize a dictionary substitution to analyze the label migration rate through a pre-defined threshold.

*Universal-oriented*. The difference in sensitivity or robustness is the primary means of distinguishing backdoor samples from clean samples. Gao *et al.* [17] utilize strong intentional perturbation (STRIP) to identify the relationship between triggers and target class. When the prediction results of inputting differently perturbed text into the backdoored model are obtained, the model calculates the corresponding entropy to recognize samples. The smaller entropy represents that this sample has a suspicious correlation. In work [96], they monitor the changes in the prediction confidence of the repeated perturbed inputs to identify and filter out poisoned inputs. A large amount of preprocessing and model inference makes STRIP computationally and time-intensive. In contrast, Yang *et al.* [50] present a word-based defense method that utilizes robustness-aware perturbations (RAP) to detect poisoned samples. Similarly, the method calculates the confidence difference between the original text and the perturbed text on the target class to discriminate the poisoned samples. It significantly reduces the computational complexity due to requiring only two prediction operations. Le *et al.* [97] leverages the concept of honeypot trapping to resist the universal trigger. To induce attackers to select the predefined triggers by the defender, the method injects multiple trapdoors that are searched from a clean model and trains both the target model and adversarial detection network. Although the trapdoor can maintain fidelity, robustness, and class awareness, it cannot cover all backdoor

triggers. Wei *et al.* [48] propose a backdoor sample detector that exploits the prediction difference of input between the model and their mutants to detect backdoor samples. The backdoored model with a custom trigger is trained to contain regardless of which backdoor attack level the trigger belongs to. And model-level mutation introduces more fine-grained observations that could reveal the mutating training data. The method also uses the DNN model to automatically extract the features of samples' prediction changes and distinguish backdoor samples from clean samples instead of threshold-based ones to avoid result bias.

*NLG-originated.* The frustratingly fragile nature of NLG models is prone and generate malicious sequences that could be sexist or offensive. Sun *et al.* [65] propose a detection component that performs a slight perturbation on a source sentence to model the semantic changes on the target side, which can defend tasks of one-to-one correspondence such as NMT. They also introduce a general defense method based on the backward probability of generating sources given targets, which can handle one-to-many issues such as dialog generation. The modification component can reconstruct hacked inputs, and generate corresponding outputs for modified inputs.

**Notes:** Insertion-oriented countermeasures are to observe changes in outlier fractions. (e.g., perplexity, logit, and self-attention scores). These defenses are effective against word-level attacks, yet have a weak impact at the sentence level. In contrast, non-insertion oriented defenses can withstand more insidious backdoor attacks. Existing works are devoted to reconstructing original samples or removing the suspicious triggers, while it is unclear whether may affect the foundation performance. We also note that analyzing the robustness between the trigger and target model can resist universal attacks, which can be realized through adversarial perturbation and model mutation. We claim that these methods require reducing computationally and time-intensive. In addition, addressing backdoor threats to NLG tasks is more important at present as the emergence of LLM.

2) *Samples Conversion:* The sample conversion refers to sanitizing suspected poisoned text from the dataset and then re-training a backdoor-free model.

*Correlation Analysis.* There is a fact that a spurious correlation is present between poisoned samples and the target label, i.e., providing more contributions to the target label. We can first identify this correlation, and then eliminate it by reconstructing original samples from poisoned samples or removing them directly. Kurita *et al.* [25] suppose that trigger keywords are likely to be rare words strongly associated with some label. They compute the relation between the label flip rate (LFR) for every word in the vocabulary over a sample dataset and its frequency in a reference dataset to locate backdoor triggers. It is impossible to enumerate all potential triggers as computationally expensive. Li *et al.* [49] present the BFClass framework, whose backbone is a pre-trained discriminator. It can identify the potential triggers to form a candidate trigger set through an objective that predicts whether each token in the corrupted text is replaced by a language model. The trigger distillation can obtain a concise set of real triggers through label information and then can wipe out

all poisoned samples through remove-and-compare strategies. Fan *et al.* [98] propose a backdoor detection method from the interpretation perspective. The interpretable RNN abstract model constructed by transforming a nondeterministic finite automaton (NFA) represents a state trace for each sentence, where the state clustering realizes the label distribution and internal aggregation. The interpretation result of each sentence can be calculated by word categorization and importance assignment. After that, the triggers are removed by migration characteristics that are threshold-based between normal sentences and backdoor sentences. Although it performs outstanding results in detecting synonym-based triggers, eliminating RNN-based model backdoors is not a key challenge. Chen *et al.* [60] propose a backdoor keyword identification (BKI) method that introduces two score functions to evaluate the local and global influence of the current word in the sample. They also design a score function based on statistical features to locate potential triggers from the keyword dictionary and then filter the samples with these triggers.

There is a finding that poisoned training examples have greater impacts on each other during training. Sun *et al.* [99] introduce the notion of the influence graph to separate the poisoned samples from the training set. To construct the influence graph without re-training the model, they utilize an approximating strategy by perturbing a specific training point to quantify the pair-wise influence to another training point. Meanwhile, incorporating the word-level information is a necessary operation to determine the maximum example word as the final influence score. The gradient of the predicted score with respect to the word embedding can compute the influence score to be differentiable. An important step, the extraction of the maximum average sub-graph, identifies suspicious poisoned data points by greedy search and agglomerative search. In work [44], an attribution-based method is proposed to precisely locate the instance-aware triggers. As the extended of BFClass [49], they introduce a discriminator to filter out poisoned samples rather than generate a candidate triggers set. For poisoned samples, the attribution-based trigger detector leverages the word-wise attribution score to compute the contribution of each token to the poisoned model's prediction since the larger attribution score has a strong correlation with the potential triggers. One important step is the instance-aware triggers of the poisoned samples are substituted with the position-embedded placeholder "[MASK]" to obtain the correct inference.

Meanwhile, the lightweight and model-free are required to focus on as well. Jin *et al.* [100] present a weakly supervised backdoor defense framework from the class-irrelevant nature of the poisoning process. As the class-indicative words are independent of the triggers, the weakly supervised text classifier is regarded as backdoor-free. The reliability of samples is built on whether the predictions of the weak classifier agree with their labels in the poisoned training set. In order to improve the overall accuracy, the weak-supervised model is refined iteratively. Moreover, the binary classifier detecting whether an instance is poisoned or not based on reliable and unsafe samples subset is a straightforward choice without any knowledge. Similarly, He *et al.* [64] suppose that this spuri-

ous correlation can be calculated from the z-scores between unigrams and the corresponding labels on benign data through lexical and syntactic features. Thus, they create a shortlist of suspicious features with high-magnitude z-scores to remove the poisoned samples. This method is robust against multiple backdoor variants, especially the invisible backdoor variant.

Data-augmentation technique, incorporating customized noise samples into the training data, achieves this goal by enhancing the semantic significance of sentences. Shen *et al.* [101] first propose a defense method that applies mixup and shuffle. The mixup strategy can destroy stealthy triggers at the embedding level by reconstructing samples from representation vectors and labels from samples. The shuffle strategy can eradicate triggers at the token level by messing with the original text to get a new text. These strategies are demonstrated to be effective in Style-based paraphrased attacks. Further research is noise-augmented data with semantic preservation generated through a paraphrasing model [102]. They propose a Noise-augmented Contrastive Learning (NCL) framework. The augmented data with all samples are further labeled correction by voting. The NCL objective is to close the homology samples in the feature space, thereby mitigating the mapping between triggers and the target label.

*Representation analysis.* There are several studies investigating the output representation of samples at the intermediate-feature level and leveraging the feature space difference to retain the possible clean samples from the training set. Li *et al.* [1] first migrate a UAP defense from the CV in response to the proposed attack. Due to the difference in different activation behaviors of the last layer, the method visualizes the relationship between the weight vector from the last layer and the difference vector which is the average value of the output's hidden states on the entire samples minus its projection. Similarly, the work [31] visualizes output low-dimensional representation by PCA and indicates some poisoned examples are pulled across the decision boundary after model poisoning. Although poisoned instances can be identified based on  $l_2$  representation distance from the trigger test examples, obtaining the triggers is impractical. Cui *et al.* [24] perform a clustering-based method that calculates output low-dimensional representation for all training samples in the suspicious model by UMNP [103] and employs HDBSCAN [104] to identify distinctive clusters. The largest predicted clusters are reserved to train the model based on the assumption that poisoned samples are fewer than normal samples. Chen *et al.* [105] propose a defense method with low inference costs and resistance to adaptive attacks. The method devises a distance-based anomaly score (DAN) that integrates the Mahalanobis distances with the distribution of clean valid data in the feature space of all intermediate layers to obtain a holistic measure of feature-level anomaly. The quantitative metric layer-wise measures the dissimilarity in each intermediate layer of the model based on normalizing the anomaly scores and then uses the max operator for aggregation to distinguish poisoned samples from clean samples at the feature level. Bagdasaryan *et al.* [62] provide specific defense for meta-backdoor. The method injects candidate triggers into inputs from a test dataset to construct pair-wise detection instances. For each candidate

trigger, they calculate the average Euclidean distance of the output representation from all pair-wise instances. The Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) measures the presence of a trigger in the input that causes anomalously large changes in output vectors. By computing the anomaly index on the resultant cosine similarity, the suspicious trigger is discovered.

**Notes:** Sample conversion focuses on removing and reconstructing poisoned samples. Correlation analysis is essential for breaking spurious correlations between triggers and target categories. Although representation analysis serves as a universal defense technique for various triggers, its impact on internal triggers from the target model remains unclear. Importantly, many countermeasures are unable to do anything about the backdoor in NLG, warranting further study.

## B. Model Inspection

1) *Model Modification:* Model modification refers to changing the parameter structure within a model to maximize the elimination of backdoors.

*Re-Init.* The Re-init method assumes that the poisoning weights of the backdoored PLM are concentrated at the high layer, so re-initializing the weights of the PLM before fine-tuning on a clean dataset can attenuate the effect of the backdoor attack. However, it is unable to cope with attacks implanted in the model's bottom layer (e.g., LWP [26]).

*NAD:* Li *et al.* [106] introduced a defense approach employing knowledge distillation to mitigate the impact of the poisoned PLM. The poisoned PLM serves as the student model, while the fine-tuned model on downstream tasks acts as the teacher model. Consequently, the teacher model supervises the fine-tuning of the student model to ensure maximum consistency in their attentional output.

*Fine-Pruning.* Liu *et al.* [107] present a fine-pruning method by blocking the path of the backdoor activated by the poisoned samples. They suppose that the neurons activated in the model are significantly different between the poisoned and benign samples. Thus, certain neurons that are not activated on the clean samples can be removed and then fine-tuned on the downstream task to obtain a pruned model. Zhang *et al.* [108] introduce fine-mixing and embedding purification (E-PUR) to mitigate backdoors in end-to-end models. The fine-mixing shuffles the backdoor weights with the clean pre-trained weights and then fine-tunes them on clean data. The E-PUR can identify the difference in words between the pre-trained weights and the backdoored weights. Unfortunately, obtaining clean PLM weights for defenders is not a practice option. In work [63], they reveal the dynamic process of fine-tuning for finding potentially poisonous dimensions according to the relationship between parameter drifts and Hessians of different dimensions. This fine-purifying method can reset and clean pre-trained weights on a small clean dataset.

*Training Strategy.* It is observed that during moderate fitting, the model primarily acquires major features for the original task, whereas subsidiary features related to backdoor triggers are learned during overfitting. Zhu *et al.* [109] explore the restriction strategies of the PLMs adaptation to the moderate-fitting stage. The model capacity trimming resorts to PET with

TABLE III  
COMPARISON AND PERFORMANCE OF EXISTING REPRESENTATIVE BACKDOOR COUNTERMEASURES

Categorization	Representative Works	Target Models	Model Access	Poisoned Data Access	Validation Data Access	Computational Resource	Defense Types <sup>3</sup>				Performance <sup>5</sup>	
							WL <sup>3</sup>	SL <sup>3</sup>	Style-based	Syntactic-based	CACC ( $\Delta$ CACC $\downarrow$ )	ASR ( $\Delta$ ASR $\downarrow$ )
Sample Filtering	Qi <i>et al.</i> [16]	LSTM BERT	○	○	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	91.65 (-1.14)	63.44 (-36.34)
	Shao <i>et al.</i> [36]	LSTM BERT	●	○	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	83.27 (-6.83)	10.40 (-89.40)
	He <i>et al.</i> [95]	BERT	●	○	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	92.35 (-1.43)	44.60 (-55.40)
	Qi <i>et al.</i> [111]	BiLSTM BERT	○	○	●	Low	⊗	⊗	/	⊗	79.96 (-10.97)	76.81 (-21.37)
	Li <i>et al.</i> [61]	BERT	○	○	●	Medium	⊗	/	/	⊗	84.64 (-6.68)	14.03 (-79.46)
	Gao <i>et al.</i> [17]	LSTM BERT	Ⓢ	○	●	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	91.39 (+0.23)	28.62 (-71.38)
	Yang <i>et al.</i> [50]	BERT	Ⓢ	○	●	Low	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	91.71 (+0.55)	27.19 (-72.81)
	Le <i>et al.</i> [97]	/	●	○	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	8.20 (-51.90)
	Wei <i>et al.</i> [48]	BERT	●	○	●	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	/	2.10 (-89.37)
	Sun <i>et al.</i> [65]	Transformer	●	○	●	Low	⊗	/	/	⊗	/	/
Sample Conversion	Kurita <i>et al.</i> [25]	BERT	Ⓢ	●	●	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.12 (+0.02)	18.40 (-81.60)
	Li <i>et al.</i> [49]	BERT	Ⓢ	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	92.11 (+0.72)	16.20 (-78.55)
	Fan <i>et al.</i> [98]	RNN	●	●	●	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	/
	Chen <i>et al.</i> [60]	LSTM	Ⓢ	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.22 (-0.96)	14.67 (-75.53)
	Sun <i>et al.</i> [99]	TextCNN BERT	Ⓢ	●	●	High	⊗	⊗	/	⊗	/	10.16 (-87.86)
	Li <i>et al.</i> [61]	TextCNN BERT	●	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.07 (-1.77)	46.41 (-50.72)
	Jin <i>et al.</i> [100]	BERT	Ⓢ	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	87.92 (-2.79)	8.52 (-87.14)
	He <i>et al.</i> [64]	BERT	Ⓢ	●	●	Low	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	92.00 (-0.00)	14.03 (-84.57)
	Shen <i>et al.</i> [101]	LSTM,BERT ALBERT,DistilBERT	●	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.89 (-0.58)	1.55 (-89.92)
	Zhai <i>et al.</i> [102]	BERT, RoBERTa DistilBERT	Ⓢ	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.29 (-0.24)	40.90 (-55.81)
Cui <i>et al.</i> [24]	BERT	Ⓢ	●	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.76 (-0.11)	26.98 (-63.86)	
Model Modification	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [51]	BERT,RoBERTa	●	Ⓢ	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	93.20 (-0.00)	29.50 (-67.00)
	Li <i>et al.</i> [106]	BERT,RoBERTa	●	Ⓢ	○	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	93.50 (+0.20)	99.70 (-0.30)
	Liu <i>et al.</i> [107]	BERT, RoBERTa	●	○	●	Low	⊗	⊗	/	/	92.00 (-1.20)	10.60 (85.90)
	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [108]	BERT	●	○	●	Low	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	89.45 (-0.33)	14.19 (-85.81)
	Zhang <i>et al.</i> [63]	BERT, RoBERTa	●	○	●	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	85.63 (-5.86)	28.80 (-69.83)
	Zhu <i>et al.</i> [109]	RoBERTa	●	●	●	Low	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	92.23 (+0.63) <sup>6</sup>	26.83 (-64.70) <sup>6</sup>
	Liu <i>et al.</i> [110]	BERT	●	●	Ⓢ	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	90.12 (-0.04)	25.98 (-66.79)
	Liu <i>et al.</i> [111]	BERT	●	○	○	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	91.01 (+1.18)	53.45 (-39.60)
Model Diagnosis	Azizi <i>et al.</i> [18]	LSTM BERT	Ⓢ	○	Ⓢ	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	21.70 (-88.10)
	Shen <i>et al.</i> [112]	BERT	○	○	Ⓢ	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	91.06 (-0.37)	42.30 (-52.96)
	Liu <i>et al.</i> [113]	BERT, RoBERTa DistilBERT, GPT	●	○	Ⓢ	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	/
	Lyu <i>et al.</i> [114]	BERT	●	○	Ⓢ	Medium	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	/
	Xu <i>et al.</i> [115]	LSTM	○	○	○	High	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	/	/

<sup>1</sup> ●: Applicable or Necessary. Ⓢ: Partially Applicable or Necessary. ○: Inapplicable or Unnecessary.

<sup>2</sup> ⊗: Practicable. ⊙: Impracticable.

<sup>3</sup> Detection capabilities of defense methods on four representative textual backdoor attacks, where WL & SL signifies that defense could resist backdoor attacks at word-level [25] and sentence-level [7].

<sup>4</sup> / signifies that the validation of such information has not been established, or it has not been performed within the proposed work.

<sup>5</sup> It shows the unified evaluation results for representative defense works, which is the declining value relative to the original CACC and ASR of the victim model (BERT) on the SST-2 text classification.

<sup>6</sup> These results are evaluated on the victim model-RoBERTa.

a global low-rank decomposition, which achieves excellent performance and realizes moderate fitting. The additional methods such as early-stop of training epochs (mentioned in work [31]), and lower learning rates are also effective in removing backdoors. Further, the work [111] provides a direct-reversing method, making the PLMs back to normal. After observing a distribution gap between the benign and poison models, they propose reversing the minimum cross-entropy loss fine-tuning of attackers with maximum entropy loss on clean data. They also introduce a metric called Stop Distance to measure the backdoor's influence. However, it is only applicable to defend the attack from AFMT and demands substantial computational resources.

*Robustness.* Liu *et al.* [110] present an end-to-end Denoised Product-of-Experts backdoor defense framework. To mitigate the toxic bias of the training dataset, they jointly train trigger-only and PoE models. The former amplifies the bias towards backdoor shortcuts by overfitting while using hyper-parameters to determine to what extent one should learn of the backdoor mapping. The PoE combines the probability distributions of the trigger-only model to fit the trigger-free residual, allowing it to make predictions with different features of the input. To address the dirty label, the denoising design re-weights training samples by the prediction confidence of the trigger-only modeling. Some suspicious samples are filtered by thresholding using the trigger-only model and a pseudo-div

set after completing ensemble training with the main model. The DPoE mitigates backdoor shortcuts, reduces the impact of noisy labels, and recognizes invisible and diverse backdoor triggers by improving the robustness of a main model.

**Notes:** Certain backdoor mechanisms are integrated into the model’s lower layer, thus fine-pruning outperforms Re-init and NAD methods in countering the backdoored model. Specific training strategies have an unexpected performance due to the backdoor’s sensitivity to hyperparameter settings. In addition, Enhancing model robustness can achieve comprehensive backdoor defense but may come at the cost of raw performance. While it helps mitigate the backdoor’s threat similar to sample filtering, complete elimination is not achieved.

2) *Model Diagnosis:* Model Diagnosis refers to identifying the backdoored model to prevent its deployment from creating subsequent hazards.

*Trigger Generation.* Azizi *et al.* [18] propose a trojan-miner method (T-Miner) whose core idea includes a perturbation generator and a trojan identifier. The former utilizes a textual style transfer model to perturb the text, transitioning it from the source class to the target class, while including words not originally present in the text as candidate perturbation sets. After filtering candidate words with lower ASR, the Trojan identifier observes outlier points by clustering dimensionality-reduced representations of randomly sampled samples and candidate perturbations set through DBSCAN to detect the backdoor model. They claim that perturbed text associated with an outlier contains a trigger word sequence. However, it is difficult to obtain prior knowledge of the trigger distribution and generate complex triggers.

*Trigger inversion.* The trigger inversion applies optimization mechanisms to reverse potential triggers. Shen *et al.* [112] introduce a dynamically reducing temperature coefficient that temperature scaling and temperature rollback in the softmax function to control optimization results. The mechanism can provide the optimizer with changing loss landscapes so that it gradually focuses on the true triggers in a convex hull. The backdoored model is detected by a threshold based on the optimal estimates of loss for a Trojan model. Liu *et al.* [113] present a backdoor scanning technique from a word-level perspective. The equivalent transformation makes the inherent discontinuity for NLP models change whole differentiable. To make feasibility in optimization results, the tanh functions smooth optimization for word vector dimension values instead of Gumbel Softmax, and a delayed normalization strategy allows trigger words to have higher inverted likelihood than non-trigger words. This process yields a concise set of probable trigger words to simplify the difficulty of inverting triggers. Word discriminative analysis uses dimension importance to judgment due to the Trojan model being discriminative for the triggers.

*Transformer Attention.* Attention, a critical component in transformer-based models, is frequently employed to measure their behavior. Lyu *et al.* [114] introduce attention to reveal its focus drifting phenomenon for the poisoned samples in the trojan model derived from which features to propose a Trojan detector. They stratify the attention head into different categories by investigating this mechanism in different layers. The

average attention entropy and attention attribution indirectly present this sight as well. The head pruning finds a correlation between attention drift and models’ misclassification. The detector utilizes the perturbed generated trigger to evaluate the model’s attention reaction to identify the Trojan model.

*Meta Neural Analysis.* Xu *et al.* [115] present a Meta Neural Trojan Detection (MNTD) framework without assumptions on the attack strategy. The MNTD conducts meta-training in the benign models and poisoned models (generated by modeling a generic distribution of any attack settings). The meta-training first uses a query set to obtain the representation vector of shadow models by a feature extraction function and then dynamically optimizes a query set together with the meta-classifier to distinguish the target model. To resist adaptive attack, they also propose a robust MNTD by setting part of the meta-classifier parameters to be random values without change and only training a query set by training shadow models. The black-box setting is invalid in NLP due to the discrete nature of the data, and training a high-quality meta-classifier for large transformer models proves challenging.

**Notes:** The model diagnosis uses a more realistic assumption. For instance, the trigger generation method (T-Miner) and the transformer attention difference method do not require any benign samples but rather just the model. However, it can only detect single-mode triggers. In contrast, trigger inversion has shown great potential in detecting complex models and triggers, while the exorbitant resources and worse accuracy need to be a further breakthrough. As for MNTD, it is hard to train a high-quality meta classifier on LLMs.

### C. Summary of Countermeasures

Table III compares different countermeasures and reports their detection performance. It is indisputable that the majority of defenses necessitate model access and validation datasets. All defenses are devoted to countering four types of attacks, including word-level-based [16], [36], [95], sentence-level based [50], [11], style-based [109], [24], [101], and syntactic-based [61], [99]. It is under the premise that none of them can effectively safeguard against all backdoor attacks, all with their limitations. While most countermeasures significantly reduce ASR, their effect on CACC varies.

Sample inspection commonly employs online inference filtering to maintain backdoor silence, but this unintentionally leads to a marked reduction in ASR, coupled with a significant decline in CACC. This can be attributed to higher FAR in poisoning sample detection or trigger localization. Sample conversion seeks to cleanse samples and train a backdoor-free model, employing two primary strategies: correlation analysis and representation analysis. It is noteworthy that many approaches that disrupt the spurious correlation between triggers and target labels may not perform effectively with all types of triggers. In contrast, the representation analysis can address it if the defender could have a method to determine poisoned clusters. Moreover, a surprising result is that all countermeasures can maintain a stable performance on CACC compared to sample filtering methods.

The backdoor mechanism is embedded within the model, which prompts defenders to address it directly through model



modification and diagnosis. In terms of model modification, the fine-purifying has absolute strength compared to Re-init and NAD, attributed to deeper adjustments on activation neurons or weights through some significant differences. In addition, enhancing model robustness or utilizing some training strategies presents a universal defense. Because model robustness has an effective ability against adversarial attacks and debias. In contrast, the model diagnostics are able to locate triggers and judge them by triggering samples in the model's response, but computational cost and accuracy should be concerns to defenders.

A practical challenge emerges as defenders prefer sample inspection to model inspection due to computational constraints. It is imperative to develop effective countermeasures for backdoor attacks in NLG. Additionally, many methods are incapable of defending against adaptive attacks. Consequently, defense studies should explicitly define the attack surface, the threat model's objectives, and the defender's capabilities.

## V. DISCUSSION AND OPEN CHALLENGES

So far, many backdoor attacks and countermeasures have been presented. To reveal the vulnerability of NLP models and provide corresponding solutions, we still require further study for backdoor attacks and defenses. This will help to build more secure development environments in the NLP community.

### A. Trigger Design

Although existing attacks present competitive results on the victim model, the three metrics of stealthiness cannot be guaranteed simultaneously in any attack surface. Hence, the feasible advancement is to migrate more covert attack schemes such as syntax, style, etc. to the APMF and APMP phases to broaden the attack range. Besides, in the AFMT phase, which possesses greater capabilities for the attacker, they should be devoted to reducing the PPL and increasing the USE.

The poisoned samples can be generated by instruction of the LLMs with natural and fluency features [59]. We also note that pre-designed a paraphrasing model by adding specific purposes (e.g., stealthiness, even including defense evasion optimization) can generate adaptive poisoned samples.

### B. Extensive Attack Study

There is a fact that backdoor implantation invariably requires the modification of training data through the insertion of pre-defined triggers. These triggers are known to attackers so they launch an active attack. However, the other insidious method is the passive attack that activates backdoors by benign users. We observe that it is used in some NLG tasks, e.g., attack a pre-defined entity that produces the desired output whenever it appears. This is uncommon in textual understanding tasks, while it is much more damaging because misdirecting a decision model using many benign users is something a single attacker cannot accomplish.

The textual understanding models are usually the main attack object for the backdoor attack. Although several studies have compromised the NLG models [29], [62], [86], [87], the

security threats of more tasks require to be revealed, such as dialogue, creative writing, and freeform question answering. Also, the diverse output or attack entity is an open challenge. Importantly, the LLMs are sweeping through NLP, able to replace all models. It has also been shown to be vulnerable to backdoor attacks [43]. Qi *et al.* [116] construct backdoor attack to expand understanding of potential vulnerabilities associated with custom-aligned LLMs. We suppose that it is crucial to promptly disclose the backdoor mechanism in LLMs.

### C. Robustness and Effective Defenses

Most defenses are empirical and only effective in specific scenarios. Resisting non-insertion attacks is a challenging task. To improve the robustness of defense, breaking through unrealistic assumptions is necessary. For example, the MNTD that identifies any threats model is a black box, which inspired us in a future direction despite not being used in transformer-based models. In addition, the universality defense method should work well on different tasks. However, these defenses are tailored in terms of classification tasks without effective countermeasures for NLG models. The establishment of security mechanisms for LLMs in particular is a matter of urgency.

The integrated end-to-end defense framework is suggested because it can first identify the backdoored model, and even when deployed, it can also execute the sample inspection. We also suggest that benign users adopt a majority vote method that randomly chooses models from different sources to make decisions collaboratively.

### D. Interpretation Analysis

The black-box nature of NLP models impedes principle-based internal mechanism analysis in backdoor attacks and defense. Recently, interpretation studies have been focused on understanding the decision process of the NLP models. Existing works (e.g., task-agnostic attack [27], [37] and representation analysis [24], [114] of defense) have applied this method, which is feasible and effective compared to some empirical methods. Also, linguistic probing is useful for revealing abnormal phenomena in the neuron, intermediate layer, and feature through different tasks. Inspired by it, we can analyze backdoor behavior and then propose stronger attacks and countermeasures.

### E. Precise Evaluation

Attack effectiveness depends on triggers, poison rate, and strategy, necessitating the proposal of a general evaluation metric to accurately reflect the outcomes. There is a conclusion that activates backdoor arise from triggers, while there may be other factors, such as noise data, outlier data, and semantic shift. Thus, it is necessary to provide a genuine attack evaluation involving trigger activation. Also, backdoors have initially revealed security vulnerabilities in LLMs, and the assessment approach should be iterated, e.g., using techniques such as GPT-4 judgment and moderation [116].

In contrast, the defense usually utilizes the reduction of attack effectiveness as the evaluation metric. Some works also

use metrics from anomaly detection [113]. We reckon the latter is a more suitable evaluation setup as it is a binary classification task on the unbalanced dataset. Notably, it is an unrealistic assumption that the defender has both clean and poisoned datasets, respectively.

### F. Impact Conversion

Things can be analyzed from both positive and negative sides. Backdoor attacks can be turned around to bring positive benefits to the NLP community. We present some hot research directions using the backdoor attack strategies as references.

1) *Watermarking*: Some works regard backdoors as a form of watermarking for safeguarding the intellectual property of models and deterring unauthorized copying and distribution. [117], [118]. This is because activating the backdoor can be seen as a declaration of model ownership, with the triggers known only to the provider. Moreover, the crucial of performance preservation on the main task ensures that the watermarking does not influence normal samples.

2) *Steganography*: Many strategies used in backdoor attacks are applicable in steganography to improve the security of information transmission [119]. Yang *et al.* [120] embed the secret data using a semantic-aware information encoding strategy, which is similar to word replacement with synonyms in backdoor attacks. Besides, syntactic and language styles could be also used to become carriers of secret data.

3) *Others*: The honeypot trapping deliberately utilizes a backdoor as bait to lure attackers [97]. It is an effective defense against optimization-based triggers (e.g., UOR [37]) since adversarial examples are often used to backdoor samples. In contrast, we can utilize the honeypot backdoor to thwart adversarial attacks. Moreover, backdoor implantation offers a practicable option for verifying the deletion of user data [121]. This is because users poison the data they possess, subsequently leading the server to be implanted with a backdoor if it uses such unauthorized data. Indeed, there is no trace of a backdoor if the server performs data deletion. This has particular relevance for NLP models, as their data originates from diverse sources and is trained on third-party platforms.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Backdoor attacks have significant consequences for NLP models, mitigated through corresponding defenses grounded in practical hypotheses. This paper presents a systematic and comprehensive review of research concerning backdoor attacks and countermeasures in the field of NLP so that responds to gaps in previous work. We outline the corresponding aims and granularity analysis according to the affected stage of the machine learning pipeline. The categorization criteria of attack surface identifies attackers' capabilities and purposes. Also, we introduce a comprehensive categorization of countermeasures against these attacks, structured around the detection objects and their internal goals. Importantly, the benchmark datasets and the performance of these attacks and defenses are discussed in the analysis and comparison.

One uncompromising fact is that there is still a significant gap between the existing attacks and countermeasures. The

purpose of the insidious attack is not to produce any harm but to sound the red alarm for the NLP security community. It is necessary to develop practical defense solutions to get rid of less realistic assumptions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Li, H. Liu, T. Dong, B. Z. H. Zhao, M. Xue, H. Zhu, and J. Lu, "Hidden backdoors in human-centric language models," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 3123–3140, 2021.
- [2] Y. Huang, T. Y. Zhuo, Q. Xu, H. Hu, X. Yuan, and C. Chen, "Training-free lexical backdoor attacks on language models," in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pp. 2198–2208, 2023.
- [3] Q. Feng, D. He, Z. Liu, H. Wang, and K.-K. R. Choo, "SecureNLP: A system for multi-party privacy-preserving natural language processing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 3709–3721, 2020.
- [4] G. Siracusano, M. Trevisan, R. Gonzalez, and R. Bifulco, "Poster: on the application of nlp to discover relationships between malicious network entities," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 2641–2643, 2019.
- [5] X. Sheng, Z. Han, P. Li, and X. Chang, "A survey on backdoor attack and defense in natural language processing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11958*, 2022.
- [6] M. J. Atallah, C. J. McDonough, V. Raskin, and S. Nirenburg, "Natural language processing for information assurance and security: an overview and implementations," in *Proceedings of the 2000 workshop on New security paradigms*, pp. 51–65, 2001.
- [7] J. Dai, C. Chen, and Y. Li, "A backdoor attack against lstm-based text classification systems," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 138872–138878, 2019.
- [8] T. Gu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, "Badnets: Identifying vulnerabilities in the machine learning model supply chain," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06733*, 2017.
- [9] Y. Gao, B. G. Doan, Z. Zhang, S. Ma, J. Zhang, A. Fu, S. Nepal, and H. Kim, "Backdoor attacks and countermeasures on deep learning: A comprehensive review," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.10760*, 2020.
- [10] F. Qi, Y. Yao, S. Xu, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Turn the combination lock: Learnable textual backdoor attacks via word substitution," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 4873–4883, 2021.
- [11] F. Qi, M. Li, Y. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Liu, Y. Wang, and M. Sun, "Hidden killer: Invisible textual backdoor attacks with syntactic trigger," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 443–453, 2021.
- [12] F. Qi, Y. Chen, X. Zhang, M. Li, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Mind the style of text! adversarial and backdoor attacks based on text style transfer," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 4569–4580, 2021.
- [13] M. Zulqarnain, R. Ghazali, Y. M. M. Hassim, and M. Rehan, "A comparative review on deep learning models for text classification," *Indones. J. Electr. Eng. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 325–335, 2020.
- [14] Z. Tan, S. Wang, Z. Yang, G. Chen, X. Huang, M. Sun, and Y. Liu, "Neural machine translation: A review of methods, resources, and tools," *AI Open*, vol. 1, pp. 5–21, 2020.
- [15] T. H. Alwaneen, A. M. Azmi, H. A. Aboalsamh, E. Cambria, and A. Hussain, "Arabic question answering system: a survey," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pp. 1–47, 2022.
- [16] F. Qi, Y. Chen, M. Li, Y. Yao, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Onion: A simple and effective defense against textual backdoor attacks," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9558–9566, 2021.
- [17] Y. Gao, C. Xu, D. Wang, S. Chen, D. C. Ranasinghe, and S. Nepal, "Strip: A defence against trojan attacks on deep neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pp. 113–125, 2019.
- [18] A. Azizi, I. A. Tahmid, A. Waheed, N. Mangaokar, J. Pu, M. Javed, C. K. Reddy, and B. Viswanath, "T-miner: A generative approach to defend against trojan attacks on dnn-based text classification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.04264*, 2021.
- [19] V. Sorin and E. Klang, "Large language models and the emergence phenomena," *European Journal of Radiology Open*, vol. 10, p. 100494, 2023.

- [20] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [21] Z. Yang, Z. Dai, Y. Yang, J. Carbonell, R. R. Salakhutdinov, and Q. V. Le, "Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [22] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, "Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5485–5551, 2020.
- [23] J. He, C. Zhou, X. Ma, T. Berg-Kirkpatrick, and G. Neubig, "Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366*, 2021.
- [24] G. Cui, L. Yuan, B. He, Y. Chen, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "A unified evaluation of textual backdoor learning: Frameworks and benchmarks," in *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [25] K. Kurita, P. Michel, and G. Neubig, "Weight poisoning attacks on pretrained models," in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2793–2806, 2020.
- [26] L. Li, D. Song, X. Li, J. Zeng, R. Ma, and X. Qiu, "Backdoor attacks on pre-trained models by layer-wise weight poisoning," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 3023–3032, 2021.
- [27] L. Shen, S. Ji, X. Zhang, J. Li, J. Chen, J. Shi, C. Fang, J. Yin, and T. Wang, "Backdoor pre-trained models can transfer to all," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pp. 3141–3158, 2021.
- [28] K. Chen, Y. Meng, X. Sun, S. Guo, T. Zhang, J. Li, and C. Fan, "Badpre: Task-agnostic backdoor attacks to pre-trained nlp foundation models," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [29] C. Xu, J. Wang, Y. Tang, F. Guzmán, B. I. Rubinstein, and T. Cohn, "A targeted attack on black-box neural machine translation with parallel data poisoning," in *Proceedings of the web conference 2021*, pp. 3638–3650, 2021.
- [30] Y. Zhou, J.-Y. Jiang, K.-W. Chang, and W. Wang, "Learning to discriminate perturbations for blocking adversarial attacks in text classification," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pp. 4904–4913, 2019.
- [31] E. Wallace, T. Zhao, S. Feng, and S. Singh, "Concealed data poisoning attacks on nlp models," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 139–150, 2021.
- [32] Y. Chen, F. Qi, H. Gao, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Textual backdoor attacks can be more harmful via two simple tricks," in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates)*, pp. 11215–11221, Association for Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2022.
- [33] K. Shao, Y. Zhang, J. Yang, X. Li, and H. Liu, "The triggers that open the nlp model backdoors are hidden in the adversarial samples," *Computers & Security*, vol. 118, p. 102730, 2022.
- [34] Z. Zhang, X. Ren, Q. Su, X. Sun, and B. He, "Neural network surgery: Injecting data patterns into pre-trained models with minimal instance-wise side effects," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 5453–5466, 2021.
- [35] X. Cai, H. Xu, S. Xu, Y. Zhang, et al., "Badprompt: Backdoor attacks on continuous prompts," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 37068–37080, 2022.
- [36] K. Shao, J. Yang, Y. Ai, H. Liu, and Y. Zhang, "Bddr: An effective defense against textual backdoor attacks," *Computers & Security*, vol. 110, p. 102433, 2021.
- [37] W. Du, P. Li, B. Li, H. Zhao, and G. Liu, "Uor: Universal backdoor attacks on pre-trained language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09574*, 2023.
- [38] X. Chen, A. Salem, D. Chen, M. Backes, S. Ma, Q. Shen, Z. Wu, and Y. Zhang, "Badnlp: Backdoor attacks against nlp models with semantic-preserving improvements," in *37th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC 2021*, pp. 554–569, Association for Computing Machinery, 2021.
- [39] W. Yang, L. Li, Z. Zhang, X. Ren, X. Sun, and B. He, "Be careful about poisoned word embeddings: Exploring the vulnerability of the embedding layers in nlp models," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 2048–2058, 2021.
- [40] W. Du, Y. Zhao, B. Li, G. Liu, and S. Wang, "Ppt: Backdoor attacks on pre-trained models via poisoned prompt tuning," in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pp. 680–686, 2022.
- [41] X. C. A. Salem and M. Zhang, "Badnlp: Backdoor attacks against nlp models," in *ICML 2021 Workshop on Adversarial Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [42] H. Kwon and S. Lee, "Textual backdoor attack for the text classification system," *Security and Communication Networks*, vol. 2021, pp. 1–11, 2021.
- [43] J. Shi, Y. Liu, P. Zhou, and L. Sun, "Badgpt: Exploring security vulnerabilities of chatgpt via backdoor attacks to instructgpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12298*, 2023.
- [44] J. Li, Z. Wu, W. Ping, C. Xiao, and V. Vydiswaran, "Defending against insertion-based textual backdoor attacks via attribution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02394*, 2023.
- [45] X. Pan, M. Zhang, B. Sheng, J. Zhu, and M. Yang, "Hidden trigger backdoor attack on {NLP} models via linguistic style manipulation," in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pp. 3611–3628, 2022.
- [46] W. Yang, Y. Lin, P. Li, J. Zhou, and X. Sun, "Rethinking stealthiness of backdoor attack against nlp models," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 5543–5557, 2021.
- [47] J. Li, Y. Yang, Z. Wu, V. Vydiswaran, and C. Xiao, "Chatgpt as an attack tool: Stealthy textual backdoor attack via blackbox generative model trigger," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14475*, 2023.
- [48] J. Wei, M. Fan, W. Jiao, W. Jin, and T. Liu, "Bdmmt: Backdoor sample detection for language models through model mutation testing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10412*, 2023.
- [49] Z. Li, D. Mekala, C. Dong, and J. Shang, "Bfclass: A backdoor-free text classification framework," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pp. 444–453, 2021.
- [50] W. Yang, Y. Lin, P. Li, J. Zhou, and X. Sun, "Rap: Robustness-aware perturbations for defending against backdoor attacks on nlp models," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 8365–8381, 2021.
- [51] Z. Zhang, G. Xiao, Y. Li, T. Lv, F. Qi, Z. Liu, Y. Wang, X. Jiang, and M. Sun, "Red alarm for pre-trained models: Universal vulnerability to neuron-level backdoor attacks," *Machine Intelligence Research*, pp. 1–14, 2023.
- [52] S. Zhao, J. Wen, L. A. Tuan, J. Zhao, and J. Fu, "Prompt as triggers for backdoor attack: Examining the vulnerability in language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01219*, 2023.
- [53] X. Chen, Y. Dong, Z. Sun, S. Zhai, Q. Shen, and Z. Wu, "Kallima: A clean-label framework for textual backdoor attacks," in *Computer Security—ESORICS 2022: 27th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 26–30, 2022, Proceedings, Part I*, pp. 447–466, Springer, 2022.
- [54] L. Gan, J. Li, T. Zhang, X. Li, Y. Meng, F. Wu, Y. Yang, S. Guo, and C. Fan, "Triggerless backdoor attack for nlp tasks with clean labels," in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 2942–2952, 2022.
- [55] X. Zhou, J. Li, T. Zhang, L. Lyu, M. Yang, and J. He, "Backdoor attacks with input-unique triggers in nlp," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14325*, 2023.
- [56] J. Yan, V. Gupta, and X. Ren, "Bite: Textual backdoor attacks with iterative trigger injection," 2023.
- [57] K. Mei, Z. Li, Z. Wang, Y. Zhang, and S. Ma, "Notable: Transferable backdoor attacks against prompt-based nlp models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17826*, 2023.
- [58] L. Xu, Y. Chen, G. Cui, H. Gao, and Z. Liu, "Exploring the universal vulnerability of prompt-based learning paradigm," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pp. 1799–1810, 2022.
- [59] J. Xu, M. D. Ma, F. Wang, C. Xiao, and M. Chen, "Instructions as backdoors: Backdoor vulnerabilities of instruction tuning for large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14710*, 2023.
- [60] C. Chen and J. Dai, "Mitigating backdoor attacks in lstm-based text classification systems by backdoor keyword identification," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 452, pp. 253–262, 2021.

- [61] X. Li, Y. Li, and M. Cheng, "Defend against textual backdoor attacks by token substitution," in *NeurIPS 2022 Workshop on Robustness in Sequence Modeling*, 2022.
- [62] E. Bagdasaryan and V. Shmatikov, "Spinning language models: Risks of propaganda-as-a-service and countermeasures," in *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 769–786, IEEE, 2022.
- [63] Z. Zhang, D. Chen, H. Zhou, F. Meng, J. Zhou, and X. Sun, "Diffusion theory as a scalpel: Detecting and purifying poisonous dimensions in pre-trained language models caused by backdoor or bias," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04547*, 2023.
- [64] X. He, Q. Xu, J. Wang, B. Rubinstein, and T. Cohn, "Mitigating backdoor poisoning attacks through the lens of spurious correlation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11596*, 2023.
- [65] X. Sun, X. Li, Y. Meng, X. Ao, L. Lyu, J. Li, and T. Zhang, "Defending against backdoor attacks in natural language generation," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, pp. 5257–5265, 2023.
- [66] X. Zhang, Z. Zhang, S. Ji, and T. Wang, "Trojaning language models for fun and profit," in *2021 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pp. 179–197, IEEE, 2021.
- [67] K. Papineni, S. Roukos, T. Ward, and W.-J. Zhu, "Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 311–318, 2002.
- [68] C.-Y. Lin, "Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries," in *Text summarization branches out*, pp. 74–81, 2004.
- [69] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pp. 3982–3992, 2019.
- [70] D. Cer, Y. Yang, S.-y. Kong, N. Hua, N. Limtiaco, R. S. John, N. Constant, M. Guajardo-Cespedes, S. Yuan, C. Tar, et al., "Universal sentence encoder for english," in *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: system demonstrations*, pp. 169–174, 2018.
- [71] Z. Yuan, Y. Liu, K. Zhang, P. Zhou, and L. Sun, "Backdoor attacks to pre-trained unified foundation models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09360*, 2023.
- [72] H. Zhao, W. Du, F. Li, P. Li, and G. Liu, "Reduce communication costs and preserve privacy: Prompt tuning method in federated learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.12268*, 2022.
- [73] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, et al., "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [74] R. OpenAI, "Gpt-4 technical report," *arXiv*, pp. 2303–08774, 2023.
- [75] H. Yang, K. Xiang, H. Li, and R. Lu, "A comprehensive overview of backdoor attacks in large language models within communication networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14367*, 2023.
- [76] H. Yao, J. Lou, and Z. Qin, "Poisonprompt: Backdoor attack on prompt-based large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12439*, 2023.
- [77] H. Huang, Z. Zhao, M. Backes, Y. Shen, and Y. Zhang, "Composite backdoor attacks against large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07676*, 2023.
- [78] J. Yan, V. Yadav, S. Li, L. Chen, Z. Tang, H. Wang, V. Srinivasan, X. Ren, and H. Jin, "Backdooring instruction-tuned large language models with virtual prompt injection," in *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop on Backdoors in Deep Learning-The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*, 2023.
- [79] Z. Xiang, F. Jiang, Z. Xiong, B. Ramasubramanian, R. Poovendran, and B. Li, "Badchain: Backdoor chain-of-thought prompting for large language models," in *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop on Backdoors in Deep Learning-The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*, 2023.
- [80] X. Liu, K. Ji, Y. Fu, W. Tam, Z. Du, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, "P-tuning: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning across scales and tasks," in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 61–68, 2022.
- [81] N. Gu, P. Fu, X. Liu, Z. Liu, Z. Lin, and W. Wang, "A gradient control method for backdoor attacks on parameter-efficient tuning," in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 3508–3520, 2023.
- [82] J. Pfeiffer, A. Kamath, A. Rücklé, K. Cho, and I. Gurevych, "Adapterfusion: Non-destructive task composition for transfer learning," in *16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, EACL 2021*, pp. 487–503, Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), 2021.
- [83] X. L. Li and P. Liang, "Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 4582–4597, 2021.
- [84] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, "Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [85] H.-y. Lu, C. Fan, J. Yang, C. Hu, W. Fang, and X.-j. Wu, "Where to attack: A dynamic locator model for backdoor attack in text classifications," in *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 984–993, 2022.
- [86] J. Wang, C. Xu, F. Guzmán, A. El-Kishky, Y. Tang, B. Rubinstein, and T. Cohn, "Putting words into the system's mouth: A targeted attack on neural machine translation using monolingual data poisoning," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pp. 1463–1473, 2021.
- [87] L. Chen, M. Cheng, and H. Huang, "Backdoor learning on sequence to sequence models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02424*, 2023.
- [88] H. Zhang, M. Cisse, Y. N. Dauphin, and D. Lopez-Paz, "mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [89] Y. Liu, B. Feng, and Q. Lou, "Trojtext: Test-time invisible textual trojan insertion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02242*, 2023.
- [90] K. Krishna, J. Wieting, and M. Iyyer, "Reformulating unsupervised style transfer as paraphrase generation," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 737–762, 2020.
- [91] S. Garg, A. Kumar, V. Goel, and Y. Liang, "Can adversarial weight perturbations inject neural backdoors," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pp. 2029–2032, 2020.
- [92] S. M. Maqsood, V. M. Ceron, and A. GowthamKrishna, "Backdoor attack against nlp models with robustness-aware perturbation defense," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05758*, 2022.
- [93] S. Dathathri, A. Madotto, J. Lan, J. Hung, E. Frank, P. Molino, J. Yosinski, and R. Liu, "Plug and play language models: A simple approach to controlled text generation," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [94] A. Gupta and A. Krishna, "Adversarial clean label backdoor attacks and defenses on text classification systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19607*, 2023.
- [95] X. He, J. Wang, B. Rubinstein, and T. Cohn, "Imbert: Making bert immune to insertion-based backdoor attacks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16503*, 2023.
- [96] F. Alsharadgah, A. Khreishah, M. Al-Ayyoub, Y. Jararweh, G. Liu, I. Khalil, M. Almutiry, and N. Saeed, "An adaptive black-box defense against trojan attacks on text data," in *2021 Eighth International Conference on Social Network Analysis, Management and Security (SNAMS)*, pp. 1–8, IEEE, 2021.
- [97] T. L. Le, N. P. Park, and D. Lee, "A sweet rabbit hole by darcy: Using honeypots to detect universal trigger's adversarial attacks," in *59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Comp. Linguistics (ACL)*, 2021.
- [98] M. Fan, Z. Si, X. Xie, Y. Liu, and T. Liu, "Text backdoor detection using an interpretable rnn abstract model," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 16, pp. 4117–4132, 2021.
- [99] X. Sun, J. Li, X. Li, Z. Wang, T. Zhang, H. Qiu, F. Wu, and C. Fan, "A general framework for defending against backdoor attacks via influence graph," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.14309*, 2021.
- [100] L. Jin, Z. Wang, and J. Shang, "Wedef: Weakly supervised backdoor defense for text classification," in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 11614–11626, 2022.
- [101] L. Shen, H. Jiang, L. Liu, and S. Shi, "Rethink the evaluation for attack strength of backdoor attacks in natural language processing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.02993*, 2022.
- [102] S. Zhai, Q. Shen, X. Chen, W. Wang, C. Li, Y. Fang, and Z. Wu, "Ncl: Textual backdoor defense using noise-augmented contrastive learning," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 1–5, IEEE, 2023.
- [103] T. Sainburg, L. McInnes, and T. Gentner, "Parametric umap: learning embeddings with deep neural networks for representation and semi-supervised learning. arxiv," *Preprint arXiv:2009*, vol. 12981, 2020.

- [104] L. McInnes, J. Healy, and S. Astels, “hdbscan: Hierarchical density based clustering,” *Journal of Open Source Software*, vol. 2, no. 11, p. 205, 2017.
- [105] S. Chen, W. Yang, Z. Zhang, X. Bi, and X. Sun, “Expose backdoors on the way: A feature-based efficient defense against textual backdoor attacks,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pp. 668–683, 2022.
- [106] Y. Li, X. Lyu, N. Koren, L. Lyu, B. Li, and X. Ma, “Neural attention distillation: Erasing backdoor triggers from deep neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.05930*, 2021.
- [107] K. Liu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, “Fine-pruning: Defending against backdooring attacks on deep neural networks,” in *International symposium on research in attacks, intrusions, and defenses*, pp. 273–294, Springer, 2018.
- [108] Z. Zhang, L. Lyu, X. Ma, C. Wang, and X. Sun, “Fine-mixing: Mitigating backdoors in fine-tuned language models,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pp. 355–372, 2022.
- [109] B. Zhu, Y. Qin, G. Cui, Y. Chen, W. Zhao, C. Fu, Y. Deng, Z. Liu, J. Wang, W. Wu, *et al.*, “Moderate-fitting as a natural backdoor defender for pre-trained language models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 1086–1099, 2022.
- [110] Q. Liu, F. Wang, C. Xiao, and M. Chen, “From shortcuts to triggers: Backdoor defense with denoised poe,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14910*, 2023.
- [111] Z. Liu, B. Shen, Z. Lin, F. Wang, and W. Wang, “Maximum entropy loss, the silver bullet targeting backdoor attacks in pre-trained language models,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 3850–3868, 2023.
- [112] G. Shen, Y. Liu, G. Tao, Q. Xu, Z. Zhang, S. An, S. Ma, and X. Zhang, “Constrained optimization with dynamic bound-scaling for effective nlp backdoor defense,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 19879–19892, PMLR, 2022.
- [113] Y. Liu, G. Shen, G. Tao, S. An, S. Ma, and X. Zhang, “Piccolo: Exposing complex backdoors in nlp transformer models,” in *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 2025–2042, IEEE, 2022.
- [114] W. Lyu, S. Zheng, T. Ma, and C. Chen, “A study of the attention abnormality in trojaned bert,” in *Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2022.
- [115] X. Xu, Q. Wang, H. Li, N. Borisov, C. A. Gunter, and B. Li, “Detecting ai trojans using meta neural analysis,” in *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 103–120, IEEE, 2021.
- [116] X. Qi, Y. Zeng, T. Xie, P.-Y. Chen, R. Jia, P. Mittal, and P. Henderson, “Fine-tuning aligned language models compromises safety, even when users do not intend to!,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03693*, 2023.
- [117] P. Li, P. Cheng, F. Li, W. Du, H. Zhao, and G. Liu, “Plmmark: A secure and robust black-box watermarking framework for pre-trained language models,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, pp. 14991–14999, 2023.
- [118] C. Gu, C. Huang, X. Zheng, K.-W. Chang, and C.-J. Hsieh, “Watermarking pre-trained language models with backdooring,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07543*, 2022.
- [119] Y. Huang, Z. Song, D. Chen, K. Li, and S. Arora, “Texthide: Tackling data privacy in language understanding tasks,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 1368–1382, 2020.
- [120] T. Yang, H. Wu, B. Yi, G. Feng, and X. Zhang, “Semantic-preserving linguistic steganography by pivot translation and semantic-aware bins coding,” *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2023.
- [121] D. M. Sommer, L. Song, S. Wagh, and P. Mittal, “Towards probabilistic verification of machine unlearning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04247*, 2020.




**Pengzhou Cheng** received the M.S. Degree from the Department of Computer Science and Communication Engineering, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China, in 2022. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. Degree with the Department of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 201100, China.

His primary research interests include artificial intelligent security, backdoor attacks and defense, cybersecurity, machine learning, deep learning, and intrusion detection system.



**Zongru Wu** received the B.S Degree from the School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Wuhan University, Hubei, China, in 2022. He is currently persuing the Ph.D. Degree with the School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 201100, China.

His primary research interests include artificial intelligence security, backdoor attack and countermeasures, cybersecurity, machine learning, and deep learning.




**Wei Du** received the B.S Degree from the School of Electronic Engineering, XiDian University, Xian, China, in 2020. He is currently persuing the Ph.D. Degree with the School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 201100, China.

His primary research interests include natural language processing, artificial intelligence security, backdoor attack, and countermeasures.



**Haodong Zhao** received his bachelor’s degree from Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU), in 2021. He is currently working toward the PhD degree in school of Cyber Science and Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University. His research interests include Federated Learning, Split Learning, AI security and natural language processing.



**Wei Lu** (Member, IEEE) received the PhD degree in computer science from the National University of Singapore, in 2009. He is currently an associate professor with the Singapore University of Technology and Design. His interests are in fundamental NLP research, with a focus on structured prediction. He is currently on the editorial board of the *Transactions of Association for Computational Linguistics*, the *Computational Linguistics Journal*, and the *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*.



**Gongshen Liu** received his Ph.D. degree in the Department of Computer Science from Shanghai Jiao Tong University. He is currently a professor with the School of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University. His research interests cover natural language processing, machine learning, and artificial intelligence security.