
Is Certifying ℓ_p Robustness Still Worthwhile?

Ravi Mangal^{*1} Klas Leino^{*1} Zifan Wang^{*2} Kai Hu^{*1} Weicheng Yu¹
Corina Păsăreanu¹³ Anupam Datta⁴ Matt Fredrikson¹

Abstract

Since the discovery of adversarial examples a decade ago, the topic of machine learning models’ resistance to being manipulated by malicious input perturbations—a property generally known as adversarial robustness—has garnered significant attention. Over the years, researchers have developed myriad attacks that exploit the ubiquity of adversarial examples, as well as defenses that aim to guard against the security vulnerabilities posed by such attacks. Of particular interest to this paper are defenses that provide provable guarantees against the class of ℓ_p -bounded attacks. Certified defenses have made significant progress, taking robustness certification from toy models and datasets to large-scale problems like ImageNet classification. While this is undoubtedly an interesting academic problem, as the field has matured, its impact in practice remains unclear, thus we find it useful to revisit the motivation for continuing this line of research. There are three layers to this inquiry, which we address in this paper: (1) why do we care about robustness research? (2) why do we care about the ℓ_p -bounded threat model? And (3) why do we care about certification as opposed to empirical defenses? In brief, we take the position that local robustness certification indeed confers practical value to the field of machine learning. We focus especially on the latter two questions from above. With respect to the first of the two, we argue that the ℓ_p -bounded threat model acts as a minimal requirement for safe application of models in security-critical domains, while at the same time, evidence has mounted suggesting that local robustness may lead to downstream external benefits not immediately related to robustness. As for the second, we argue that (i) certification provides a resolution to the cat-and-mouse game of adversarial attacks; and furthermore, that (ii) perhaps contrary to popular belief, there may not exist a fundamental trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and certifiability, while moreover, certified training techniques constitute a particularly promising way for learning robust models.

1. Introduction

The discovery of adversarial examples (Szegedy et al., 2013)—slightly perturbed versions of natural inputs that can fool well-trained, highly-performant classifiers into misclassification—marked a significant moment in the history of deep learning, alerting us to the brittleness of these methods. In the ensuing decade, there has been intense research on theoretically understanding the underlying reasons for the existence of such adversarial examples (Vardi et al., 2022; Frei et al., 2023), though a full understanding remains out of reach. At the same time, we have witnessed a cat-and-mouse game between attackers and defenders: attackers propose ever stronger attacks that exploit this vulnerability while defenders present techniques for safeguarding models against such attacks.¹ The attacks studied in the literature typically assume *norm-bounded adversaries*, i.e., adversaries that are restricted to input perturbations within a bounded ℓ_p ball while the general goal of the defenses is to ensure that models are locally robust, i.e., not susceptible to adversarial perturbations (formally written in Def. 2.1), at all in-distribution points.

The massive body of research on adversarial attacks and defenses has been guided by some basic underlying assumptions:

- ① Adversarially robust models are desirable.

^{*}Equal contribution ¹Carnegie Mellon University ²Center for AI Safety ³NASA Ames ⁴Truera. Correspondence to: Ravi Mangal <rmangal@andrew.cmu.edu>, Klas Leino <kleino@cs.cmu.edu>, Zifan Wang <zifan@safe.ai>, Kai Hu <kaihu@cs.cmu.edu>.

¹A conservative estimate suggests that the number of papers on arXiv related to adversarial robustness is likely to exceed 8,000 by the year 2024 (car).

Table 1: Summary of our viewpoints.

Section 3: Why do we care about robustness research?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The absence of robustness leads to security issues. b) Robustness is necessary for conceptual soundness. c) Scaling does not ensure robustness. d) Robustness can improve system-level safety.
Section 4: Why do we care about ℓ_p robustness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ℓ_p robustness is the bedrock for non-ℓ_p robustness. b) Semantic similarity cannot be formalized. c) ℓ_p robustness leads to other desirable model properties.
Section 5: Why do we care about certification?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Clarification on useful notions of certification. b) Certifying robustness is a way to escape the cat-and-mouse game via post-training and inference-time formal guarantees. c) There is no theoretical trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and certifiability via Lipschitzness.

- ② Norm-bounded adversaries are worth studying.
- ③ Certified defenses, if feasible, can end the cat-and-mouse game between attackers and defenders.

Though the extensive use of these assumptions in the literature might suggest a universal consensus amongst the community about their validity, we find it useful to revisit these assumptions, particularly in light of the fact that impact of this research in practice is unclear—models continue to be susceptible to adversarial examples yet practitioners are willing to deploy these models in production systems, and certified defenses are not widely adopted. While the problems posed by the existence of adversarial examples are technically challenging and academically interesting, might it be the case that they are of limited practical relevance and not worthy of the resources invested by the academic community?

Consider assumption ①. While robustness may seem like an obviously desirable property given the existence of adversarial examples, the situation is more nuanced in practice. Machine learning models are rarely used in isolation; instead, they are typically deployed as components of larger systems, for instance, as the perception module in a cyber-physical system, or as the recommendation module in a socio-technical system. Does robustness of the model enable safe, secure and correct behavior of the larger system? The usefulness of model robustness as a desirable property hinges on the answer to this relatively unexplored question. On the other hand, concerns about ②, i.e., a threat model that only allows norm-bounded adversaries have been repeatedly raised in the literature (Gilmer et al., 2018; Hendrycks et al., 2021b). Such a threat model is simultaneously too weak, since it artificially constraints the adversary in a way that real-world adversaries are not constrained, and too strong, since it allows adversaries to arbitrarily perturb inputs in an ℓ_p ball which requires adversaries to have complete control over the inputs to the model. We engage with both these assumptions in this paper (Sections 3 and 4, respectively) and argue for their validity.

The last assumption, ③, just like the first assumption, seems obviously valid at face value; after all, by definition, a certified defense ought to protect against any norm-bounded adversary. Indeed, if a model is certified ϵ -locally robust at a point x (with respect to some ℓ_p norm), no ϵ -bounded perturbation of x can affect the model output and thus, the model is protected from any norm-bounded adversary at x . However, this is only a *local* guarantee. What is the guarantee provided by a certified defense on the global model behavior? While we believe that the community is aware of the nature of the global guarantee, a precise formalization of the guarantee has been lacking in the literature. We provide such a definition in Section 5.2. At the same time, the notion of certified defense itself can be ambiguous and can mean different things in different contexts. Certified defense may refer to training the model such that the worst-case loss of the model is minimized (Wong et al., 2018; Goyal et al., 2018a; Leino et al., 2021). It may also refer to evaluating the percentage of points in the test dataset where the trained model is accurate as well as certifiably robust (giving an estimate of the model accuracy on unseen data in the presence of an adversary) (Zhang et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2021; Katz et al., 2019; Brix et al., 2023). Finally, it may refer to an inference-time certified check for robustness, with the model abstaining from prediction whenever the check fails (Leino et al., 2022b; Mangal & Pasareanu, 2022; Tramer, 2022). We clarify the different notions of certifications that apply at different stages of a model’s lifecycle and the nature of the guarantee afforded by certification (Section 5.1).

Assumption ③ also touches upon the *feasibility* of certified defenses. There is a belief in some quarters of the community




Figure 1: (a) An adversarial example found in a vision classifier that fools the model’s prediction (Szegedy et al., 2013). (b) An adversarial audio example that fools an Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) model (Hussain et al., 2021). (c) An example of adversarial suffix jailbreaks aligned LLMs, e.g. ChatGPT, to elicit harmful outputs (Zou et al., 2023).

that there might be a fundamental trade-off between accuracy and robustness (Fawzi et al., 2018; Tsipras et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019a). At the same time, local robustness certification is known to be NP-complete (Katz et al., 2017). We clarify that, in theory, under mild and realistic distributional assumptions about separability of differently labeled samples, there is no trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and efficient certifiability of a model, building upon the results of (Yang et al., 2020b; Leino, 2023). Moreover, we argue for the position that incorporating Lipschitz-based certifiers into the training procedures might be the most promising approach for achieving accurate, robust, and efficiently certifiable models (Section 5.3).

2. Review of Adversarial Robustness

2.1. What Are Adversarial Examples?

Adversarial examples are input instances that are carefully crafted to cause a machine learning model, especially deep neural networks, to make a mistake in its prediction. While these perturbations are typically undetectable to the human eyes in visual contexts, they can lead the model to produce outputs that are substantially different from the expected predictions. One classic adversarial example (Fig.1a) found by Szegedy et al. (Szegedy et al., 2013) is that the prediction of an image classifier is easily steered from Panda to Gibbon when adversarial noise is added to the benign input.

Adversarial examples extend beyond mere images; they permeate nearly every genre of deep models and data formats. In sentiment analysis for text input, by swapping specific words with their synonymous counterparts, the adversary is able to toggle the sentiment prediction (Tsai et al., 2019; Hou et al., 2023). Similarly, Fig.1b shows that by adding adversarial wavelets that are indistinguishable by human ears to an audio input, the output transcript of an Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) model will be manipulated into Cancel my meeting, whereas it sounds like What is the time? to humans (Hussain et al., 2021). Although learning theory-based analysis tends to blame the generalization gap between the training data and all unseen data (including the adversarial ones) just to the capacity of the model and the suboptimal optimization (Neyshabur et al., 2017), however, it is worth noting that even large models have been shown to have remarkable abilities for zero-shot learning (Kojima et al., 2022), they still fail inevitably against adversarial examples. Recent research has shown that even Large Language Models (LLMs) and large multimodal models, extensively trained with copious human feedback to align their responses with human ethics and regulations, can succumb to adversarial manipulations (Maus et al., 2023; Carlini et al., 2023; Zou et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2023). In Fig.1c, we use the example presented by Zou et al. (2023) where the gibberish-style suffix generated by an attacker aids to break the aforementioned safety guardrail of ChatGPT².

The vulnerability to adversarial examples was initially seen primarily as a security concern in the machine learning systems,

²<https://chat.openai.com/>




Figure 2: A simplified taxonomy of certification methods based on a full taxonomy from Li et al. (Li et al., 2023) and recent works that have not been included yet (Shi et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2023b).

i.e. a bug in the learned system. However, numerous subsequent studies have highlighted a more profound issue: failing at adversarial examples is a sign that these networks exhibit behaviors vastly different from humans (Ilyas et al., 2019; Gavrikov et al., 2023; Wang, 2023). For instance, while humans identify an image based on its foreground object and label it as "Panda" in Fig.1a, deep learning models aren't necessarily constrained to this logic. Towards that end, adversarial perturbations to those unrelated (i.e. non-robust) features in the input "hijack" the predictions.

2.2. Norm-bounded Adversaries

Unless otherwise specified, we consistently use the terms "model" or "network" to refer to a "classifier" in this paper. While it is worth noting that adversarial robustness is a pertinent property of regression models or other models generating continuous outputs, the precise definition of robustness tends to vary in each case, contingent upon the specific application of said continuous output. In contrast, adversarial robustness for classifiers is consistently defined across publications, as the integer output is universally interpreted as the category of the input. Moreover, insights from research on robust classifiers often shed a light on robustness in regressions and related tasks. Since this paper aims to present perspectives on robustness certification to a broad research audience, we can focus the discussion on deep neural network classifiers without loss of generality.

A major line of robustness research focuses on ℓ_p -norm-bounded adversaries, which is also the focal point of this work. The original motivation to constrain the perturbations to the input within a small ℓ_p -ball is to ensure the perturbation is imperceptible to humans. While this section provides the foundations for ℓ_p -norm constraints used in the broad adversarial robustness research, Section 4 underpins the motivation and value of studying this type of adversary, along with a discussion of the impact of methods motivated by ℓ_p balls on other types of adversaries.

In practice, these adversaries search norm-bounded perturbations that turn a given sample into an adversarial example. Fast Gradient Sign Method (Goodfellow et al., 2015) was first proposed to find ℓ_∞ -bounded perturbations. As a more generic and iterative method, Projected Gradient Descend (PGD) (Madry et al., 2018) is a well-known baseline attack for all ℓ_p -norm-bounded setup. Follow-up studies (Carlini & Wagner, 2017; Uesato et al., 2018) proposed to use better optimization methods and different losses to find higher quality adversarial examples. Auto-attack (Croce & Hein, 2020b), an ensemble of the FAB attack (Croce & Hein, 2020a), the Square Attack (Andriushchenko et al., 2020) and two PGD attack variants, is widely used to benchmark the robustness of state-of-the-art robust classifiers (Croce et al., 2020).

Formally, let F be a neural network that takes an input $x \in X$ and predicts an integer class $y = F(x), y \in [m]$. The ℓ_p norm of a vector x is denoted as $\|x\|_p$. Thus, this so-called norm-bounded adversary is crafting a nearby point x' within a ℓ_p -ball of a radius ϵ , often referred to as the budget of the adversary, centered at x . Common choices of p include 1, 2 and ∞ . The goal of the defender is therefore to improve the *local robustness* (Def. 2.1) of the model at all relevant inputs.




Figure 3: An illustration of conceptual soundness. (a) Models make predictions on two inputs and model 2 is clearly wrong for the cat image. (b) Each model’s internal logic for image predictions is summarized. Model 1 accurately uses the subject (i.e. the dog), whereas model 2 mistakenly focuses on the tennis ball, associating it with the dog class. We say in this case model 1 is conceptually sound and model 2 is not.

Definition 2.1 (ϵ -Local Robustness). A model $F : X \rightarrow [m]$ is ϵ -locally robust at x with respect to norm, $\| \cdot \|_p$, if

$$\forall x' \in X, \|x' - x\|_p \leq \epsilon \implies F(x') = F(x).$$

2.3. Defending Against Adversarial Examples

Models trained to minimize the standard loss functions, e.g. cross entropy, are generally not robust to adversarial examples. Goodfellow et al. (Goodfellow et al., 2015) first included adversarial examples into training to defend against attacks. Two seminal works that became the foundation of *adversarial training* includes PGD training (Madry et al., 2018) and TRADES (Zhang et al., 2019b). Since then, methods for training robust models have been of central interest to the machine learning community. Probably hundreds or more methods have been developed since then from many different perspectives, to name a few, metric learning (Mao et al., 2019; Pang et al., 2019a; Zhou & Patel, 2022), self-supervised learning (Chen et al., 2020; Naseer et al., 2020), ensemble learning (Tramèr et al., 2017; Pang et al., 2019b) and data augmentation (Rebuffi et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023; Hendrycks et al., 2020).

Adversarial training offers only an empirical robustness guarantee against the specific attack method used during evaluation. It’s likely that the empirical robust accuracy (ERA) — which represents the percentage of data points deemed both correct and robust against the best available attack at testing — serves merely as an upper-bound for the true robustness of the data. Consequently, ERA is contingent upon the time of assessment and is specific to a particular attack or a defined set of attacks. In safety-critical domains especially, a stronger (or formal) guarantee of robustness is preferred. One solution to this cat-and-mouse game is to train a model capable of *certifying the local robustness* of its predictions within a small neighborhood in the input space—the main focus of this paper.

Formally, given a classifier $F : X \rightarrow [m]$, an ϵ -bounded local robustness certifier $C_\epsilon^F : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a function that returns a boolean output to indicate if F is locally robust at x . A *sound* certifier (Def. 2.2) is therefore free of false positive.

Definition 2.2 (Soundness of Certification). For a classifier $F : X \rightarrow [m]$, a certifier $C_\epsilon^F : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is sound if $\forall x \in X$,

$$C_\epsilon^F(x) = 1 \implies F \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-locally robust at } x.$$

Hereafter, whenever we refer to a certifier, we assume it is sound unless stated otherwise.

Certifiers can be classified as either *complete* or *incomplete* based on the outcome when $C_\epsilon^F(x) = 0$. Specifically, a *complete* certifier is one where an adversarial example is identified through its algorithmic design. Conversely, a certifier is deemed *incomplete* if it concludes with $C_\epsilon^F(x) = 0$ either due to the discovery of an adversarial example or because it is unable to prove local robustness before reaching a predetermined termination condition. Therefore, it is important to note that if C_ϵ^F is incomplete, $C_\epsilon^F(x) = 0$ does not imply that an adversarial example necessarily exists within the ϵ -ball.

Complete certification is an NP-complete problem for deep neural networks (Katz et al., 2017). Due to the high computational cost, existing complete certification methods (Pulina & Tacchella, 2010; Tjeng et al., 2017; Katz et al., 2017; Wang et al.,

2018; Bunel et al., 2020) have difficulty in scaling to modern networks (Li et al., 2023). Incomplete certifiers can be categorised into probabilistic and deterministic methods. Probabilistic methods provide local robustness guarantees with a probability³, meaning that there could exist false positive claims. Existing probabilistic methods (Cohen et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2020a; Jeong et al., 2021; Carlini et al., 2022) add random noise to smooth classifiers and rely on Monte Carlo sampling to provide robustness bounds. As a result, these methods require extensive sampling during the certification process and are thus very expensive; for instance, they are typically evaluated on a 1% subset of the ImageNet validation set for timing concerns (Cohen et al., 2019; Carlini et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2022). There are a great number of deterministic categories and here we include a few examples, e.g. internal bound propagation methods (Gowal et al., 2018b; Morawiecki et al., 2019), linear relaxation methods (Weng et al., 2018; Salman et al., 2019; Singh et al., 2019; Dvijotham et al., 2018), solving a semi-definite programming (Dathathri et al., 2020; Fazlyab et al., 2020; Raghunathan et al., 2018), and using the global Lipschitz bounded networks (Trockman & Kolter, 2021; Leino et al., 2021; Araujo et al., 2023). A summary and comparison of certification method is shown in Fig. 2

3. Why do we care about robustness research?

In general, the concerns around robustness are uncontroversial, as it is widely recognized that adversarial examples pose a security vulnerability. For completeness, we begin with an overview of the common justifications that ubiquitously motivate the robustness literature. Although it is less universally acknowledged, in addition to its relation to security, robustness can be viewed more generally with respect to model quality, as a path to *conceptual soundness*—the tendency of a model to use high-level features that are recognized by humans as appropriate for explaining its inferences. We also contend with the objection that, despite the importance of robustness as a model property, *robustness research* may be redundant from the perspective of *scaling laws*, which perhaps suggest that data and model capacity are sufficient for fixing any model shortcomings. Finally, we discuss some recent observations from the formal safety analysis of vision-based cyber-physical systems suggesting that improved robustness of perception models can translate into improved overall safety of the system in a formally provable sense.

Lack of Robustness Is A Security Issue Clearly, adversarial examples negatively impact the reliability of neural networks that are vulnerable to them—and constitute a security concern in safety-critical machine learning systems—as they lead to unexpected erroneous behavior on seemingly benign inputs. Numerous examples, as listed by Carlini et al. (2019), have shown that it is possible to generate physical adversarial examples, e.g. eyeglasses (Sharif et al., 2016; 2017) and T-shirts (Xu et al., 2020) that fool facial recognition systems, patches that make autonomous vehicles recognize stop signs as speed limit signs (Eykholt et al., 2018), web content that causes an ad-blocker to consider an advertisement as neutral content (Tramèr et al., 2018), etc.

As AI systems get more powerful, their potential misuse can pose a significant threat, as they can be deliberately employed to instigate widespread damage (Hendrycks et al., 2023). Modern large models are trained to align with ethical behaviors (Ziegler et al., 2019; Hendrycks et al., 2021a; Ouyang et al., 2022) so they reject following harmful instructions, e.g., providing instructions on creating bio-weapons. However, recent research has shown that the current aligned models are de-facto not adversarially aligned (Maus et al., 2023; Carlini et al., 2023; Zou et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2023). Automated methods are able to break the guardrails and instruct large models to generate harmful contents for the adversary’s own benefit as is shown in Fig. 1c.

Robustness Is Necessary for Conceptual Soundness Consider the thought experiment originally set up by Leino (Leino, 2022) as illustrated in Fig. 3. Two models in Fig. 3a perform image classification, yet model 2 erroneously categorizes a cat image as a dog. Suppose we are able to “talk” to the models to discover the most important input features they rely on to make their predictions. An explanation like the circled features in Fig. 3b would reveal that the error in model 2 arises because it detects a tennis ball and associates it with the dog class. While tennis balls might be linked with dogs in the training data, they are not the deciding factor to any human for distinguishing between cats and dogs. Put differently, a tennis ball is *not* a sound concept for classifying cats and dogs. Thus, we will say that model 2 is not *conceptually sound*. By contrast, model 1 uses appropriate features to form its internal logic, and can therefore be considered *conceptually sound*. This quality is essential for trustworthiness in any machine learning model, even if they perform well otherwise.

³An acceptable probability is usually no lower than 99.9% to participate in a public leaderboard (<https://sokcertifiedrobustness.github.io/leaderboard/>).

Upon closer inspection, it becomes clear that the existence of adversarial examples in a network must constitute a violation of conceptual soundness. The adversarial perturbation, which is semantically meaningless by construction, is nonetheless causally relevant to changing the model’s prediction, as witnessed by the anomalous prediction it induces. Thus, these adversarial perturbations can be thought of as corresponding to some ill-conceived concept that the network erroneously encodes and employs.

Scaling Itself Does Not Resolve Lack of Robustness Arguably, the so-called “renaissance” of machine learning has been driven first and foremost by the dramatic scaling of model capacity and training set sizes. Supported conceptually by PAC theories, and empirically by the impressive and continuous progress made in the last decade, many remain bullish on the prospect that the power of scaling is far from reaching its limits. It might seem logical to assume that the absence of adversarial robustness stems from an insufficiently large training set, which fails to allow the model to generalize to corner cases, including adversarial examples. One might hypothesize that by simply enhancing the model’s performance and generalization, the problem of adversarial susceptibility would dissipate as both models and dataset sizes scale up.

Counter arguments towards this over-optimistic opinion are two-fold. From a theoretical perspective, it is often hard to nail down what precisely is entailed by a training “distribution,” however, it more clear that adversarial examples are, almost by design, off-manifold points that can not be easily sampled from distributions of natural inputs. Therefore, it is unclear that scaling laws driving generalization have meaningful bearing on adversarial robustness. On the empirical side, evidence from experiments on the current largest classification models (and generative models) indicate that adversarial examples still persist, especially when developers rely solely on the standard training techniques.

Robustness Can Improve System-level Safety Recent works (Calinescu et al., 2022; Păsăreanu et al., 2023) on proving safety of vision-based cyber-physical systems have observed that higher accuracy of the models used for vision-based perception can lead to stronger formal safety guarantees for the overall system. It has also been observed that, in practice, models trained in a robustness-aware manner show a correlation between accuracy and robustness (Calinescu et al., 2022)—the model tends to be more accurate on points where it is locally-robust. These two observations suggest that improving the robustness of the classifier used for perception can have a direct impact on the safety of the overall system.

4. Why do we care about ℓ_p robustness?

Constraining adversarial perturbations within a small ℓ_p -ball around a benign input is inspired by the spirit of perceptual similarity. Often, humans cannot detect these minuscule changes, so it is desirable for deep models to emulate this human trait. In other words, if the perturbations are noticeable to humans and they change the semantic meaning of the input, it wouldn’t be reasonable to expect the model’s outputs to remain unchanged. Besides this intuitive motivation, there are a number of other reasons in favor of researching ℓ_p robustness.

ℓ_p Robustness Is the Bedrock for Non- ℓ_p Robustness An ℓ_p -ball is not the only set that can represent semantic similarities. For example, in visual object detection, rotations and translations of objects often do not change what humans would label them with; however, the rotation set of an image cannot be represented by a ℓ_p -ball. Similarly, in classifying text data, some gibberish strings do not directly fit into the ℓ_p -ball of the input. However, methods developed for ℓ_p robustness also help to formulate the definitions in these non- ℓ_p setups. For example, while the set of rotations of an image is not an ℓ_p -ball, research works attempt to parameterize the rotation matrix and bound the corresponding parameters in a ℓ_p -ball (Wang et al., 2022a; Yang et al., 2023), which also applies to other general matrix-defined transformations (Dumont et al., 2018; Hao et al., 2022; Balunovic et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2023; Hsiung et al., 2023). Moreover, recent findings show that the improved ℓ_p robustness can lead to the improved robustness for non- ℓ_p robustness (Mao et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2020).

General Semantic Similarity Cannot Be Formally Specified and Certified Specifying the (perceptual) similarity between inputs as ℓ_p distances is the cornerstone to develop formal verification tools towards ending the cat-and-mouse game between attackers and defenders. Arguably, the general notion of semantic similarity between any two images cannot be specified in a formal way that can be used for certifying robustness. It is perhaps possible for image-based searching or contrast learning to use a second deep model to measure the similarity between pairs of inputs. In this case, the semantic similarity is not specified but determined with the opaque (and probably not reliable) inner workings of the judging model. In the worst case, the adversary can just fool the classifier and the similarity model at the same time and any certification relying on such judging model is always unsound (i.e. the certifier may return false negative results).




Figure 4: An illustration of the differences between training empirical robust models and certifiably robust models. AutoAttack (Croce & Hein, 2020b) is a set of attacks commonly used to report the empirical robust accuracy. Of particularly note, the process of the certifying robustness is adversary-free, therefore, the model is guaranteed to be robust at certified points with future (i.e. unknown) attacks.

ℓ_p **Robustness Connects to Other ML Fields** Besides adversarial robustness, ℓ_p robustness can lead to many other desirable properties such as out-of-distribution robustness (Bitterwolf et al., 2020; Setlur et al., 2022), improved transfer learning (Deng et al., 2021; Salman et al., 2020), and increased interpretability and trustworthiness of the model’s prediction (Wang, 2023; Wang et al., 2022b; Etmann et al., 2019; Tsipras et al., 2019) as well as help with generalization (Xie et al., 2020), understanding memorization of training points (Leino et al., 2022a), learn invertible functions (Behrmann et al., 2019) and build stable GANs (Zhong et al., 2020).

5. Why do we care about certification?

Given the arguments in previous sections demonstrating that robustness research is important and ℓ_p norm-bounded adversaries represent a theoretically and practically useful threat model, certification seems desirable to guarantee protection against such adversaries. However, we clarify in Section 5.1 that the notion of certification depends on the context and means different things at different stages of the learning pipeline. Nevertheless, at each of these stages, certification can yield formal guarantees that can help escape from the cat-and-mouse game between attackers and defenders. The nature of these guarantees is made precise in Section 5.2. Furthermore, in theory, there is no fundamental trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and efficient certifiability—under mild distributional assumptions, there always exists a Lipschitz-bounded function that is perfectly accurate and robust (Section 5.3). We therefore argue that certified training that incorporates Lipschitz-based certification offers a promising path towards learning this theoretically feasible and desirable function.

5.1. Notions of Certification

Prior to making an argument supporting the utility of robustness certification, it is worth distinguishing between three particular settings in which certification may be applied, which correspond to three stages of the learning pipeline: training, evaluation (post-training, pre-deployment), and inference (post-deployment). Certification methods may apply to more than one stage, but not all methods are practically applicable to every stage. Unsurprisingly, the value of certification depends on the context(s) it can be applied to. In the remainder of Section 5.1, we will provide a brief overview of the important distinctions between *certified training*, *post-training certification*, and *inference-time certification*, allowing us to frame our discussion of utility accordingly.

Certified Training Certified training refers to any training method that directly or indirectly incorporates robustness certification into its training objective. Typically, this involves incorporating a sound certification procedure into the model’s loss function, however many approaches simply employ heuristics that make certification with some sound procedure easier. Certified training is generally used in conjunction with a certification procedure that is applied post-training and/or at inference time; however, within this paradigm, the certification procedure may assume control over the structure and parameters of the model. Generally speaking, not all certification procedures are amenable to certified training, as training requires differentiability, and sufficient performance and parallelizability to be practically run over thousands of batches throughout training.

Post-training Certification Post training certification applies a certification procedure to a validation dataset in order to estimate the Verified Robust Accuracy (VRA), i.e., the fraction of points on which the model is both correct *and* certifiably robust. Post-training certification can be applied either post hoc (i.e., assuming we have no control over the model that must be certified), or in conjunction with certified training. In the latter case, incomplete certifiers that would otherwise provide loose robustness guarantees may (and indeed, do) become highly practical, particularly because of their superior speed (Gowal et al., 2018a; Leino et al., 2021). Moreover, while post-training certification does not necessitate “real-time” performance, complete methods—exponential by nature—may be intractable, harming the measured VRA whenever the procedure fails to terminate.

Inference-time Certification Inference-time certification provides additional security for an ML-based system during deployment by using a certification procedure to produce a point-wise robustness certificate to accompany each prediction. The certificate can be handled by the system in various ways, e.g., by rejecting inputs that cannot be certified, or by flagging them for human involvement. Like post-training certification, inference-time certification can be applied post hoc, or in conjunction with certified training. Typically, methods capable of post-training certification can also be applied at inference time; however, in deployment settings, performance (in terms of speed) is often indispensable, thus “real-time” methods are typically required.

We contend that *certification is primarily useful within the certified-training paradigm*. While post hoc certification is an interesting research problem, the inability to apply tailored regularization to the model being certified kneecaps our ability to leverage highly efficient (but incomplete and potentially loose) certification procedures, which have the speed to make inference-time certification practical. Meanwhile, complete certification is known to be NP-complete on general networks (Katz et al., 2017), severely limiting the application of complete post hoc methods in practice, especially at inference time. For a sense of scale, state-of-the-art post hoc certification techniques can require as much as *five minutes* per instance to be able to terminate on up to 80% of instances on a small, adversarially trained ResNet architecture (Bak et al., 2021). Moreover, where comparable, the VRAs reported for top certified training procedures substantially surpass those recorded for post hoc certification of adversarially trained networks.⁴

On the other hand, as we will discuss in Section 5.3, tailored certified training techniques are a promising avenue for achieving *higher* VRA with real-time certification procedures. Overall, these considerations suggest that efforts that focus only on post-training robustness certification are overly narrow.

5.2. Empirical vs Certified Defenses: Escaping the cat-and-mouse game

In this section, we discuss the reasons for preferring certified defenses over empirical ones in the post-training and post-deployment (i.e., inference-time) phases of the model lifecycle. An oft-cited reason in the robustness literature in the favor of certified defenses is that they help escape the cat-and-mouse game between norm-bounded adversaries and defenders—certification ensures that no norm-bounded adversary can successfully attack the model. Indeed, if a model is certified ϵ -locally robust at a point x (with respect to some ℓ_p norm), no ϵ -bounded perturbation of x can affect the model output and the model is protected from any norm-bounded adversary at x . This, however, is a *local* guarantee. We find that the nature of the *global* guarantee granted by certification is often left unspecified in the literature. In addition, as discussed in Section 5.1, the notion of certification itself can mean different things depending on the context. We clarify and formally

⁴See (Li et al., 2023) for an overview of state-of-the-art VRA for various datasets, ℓ_p norms, and perturbation budgets. These can be compared to VRA numbers reported in the VNN-COMP neural network verification competition (Bak et al., 2021). Notably, VNN-COMP only evaluates against ℓ_∞ perturbations, which can be analyzed by IBP techniques; no post hoc certification method has recorded nontrivial results for ℓ_2 perturbations on adversarially trained models of the scale presented in VNN-COMP.

express the guarantees realized via certification here.

Post-training Certification The goal of post-training certification is to *measure* the percentage of points in a held-out dataset where the model is both accurate and certified as ϵ -locally robust. This percentage, usually referred to as the empirical Verified Robust Accuracy ($\overline{\text{VRA}}$), can help estimate the model accuracy on unseen data in the presence of any norm-bounded adversary. $\overline{\text{VRA}}$ on a dataset d with n labeled (x_i, y_i) pairs is defined as

$$\overline{\text{VRA}}(F, d) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{F(x_i)=y_i \wedge C_\epsilon^F(x)=1}.$$

where C_ϵ^F is a complete or incomplete certifier.

The corresponding definition of Verified Robust Accuracy (VRA), in expectation, with respect to a distribution \mathcal{D} is

$$\text{VRA}(F, \mathcal{D}) := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x)=F^*(x) \wedge C_\epsilon^F(x)=1}]$$

Theorem 5.3 formally states the relationship between VRA of the model on the non-perturbed distribution \mathcal{D} and its accuracy (Acc^5) with respect to all possible perturbations of \mathcal{D} (see Def. 5.1) that can be the result of a norm-bounded adversary.

Definition 5.1 (Perturbations of a Distribution). Let \mathcal{D} be a distribution over X , $B_\epsilon := \{v \mid \|v\|_p \leq \epsilon\}$ be the ball of norm ϵ -bounded vectors, and $\Delta_\epsilon := \{\Delta \mid \text{supp}(\Delta) \subseteq B_\epsilon\}$ be the set of all distributions whose support is in B_ϵ . Then the set $\text{Per}_\epsilon(\mathcal{D})$ of perturbed distributions with respect to \mathcal{D} that are the result of any norm-bounded adversary is defined as:

$$\text{Per}_\epsilon(\mathcal{D}) := \{x \sim \mathcal{D}; \delta \sim \text{Adv}(x); \text{return } (x + \delta) \mid \text{Adv} \in X \rightarrow \Delta_\epsilon\}$$

Adv represents a norm-bounded adversary that maps each input to a perturbation distribution (for a deterministic adversary, this is a Dirac delta distribution) from Δ_ϵ .

Theorem 5.3 uses the notion of a distribution \mathcal{D} being ϵ -separable with respect to a classifier $F : X \rightarrow [m]$. Intuitively, if any pair of points in the support of \mathcal{D} (denoted as $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$) are assigned different labels by F , then, for \mathcal{D} to be ϵ -separable, the points should be at least 2ϵ apart. Def. 5.2 states this formally.

Definition 5.2 (ϵ -Separability). Let $F : X \rightarrow [m]$ be a classifier and \mathcal{D} be a distribution over X . Then \mathcal{D} is ϵ -separable with respect to F if,

$$\forall x, x' \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D}). F(x) \neq F(x') \implies \|x - x'\|_p \geq 2\epsilon$$

Theorem 5.3 (Post-training Certification). Let $F : X \rightarrow [m]$ be a classifier, $F^* : X \rightarrow [m]$ be the corresponding ground-truth labeling function, and \mathcal{D} be an ϵ -separable distribution over X wrt F^* from which unperturbed inputs for the classification task are drawn. If $\forall x \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$, $F^*(x)$ is ϵ -locally robust, then

$$\forall \mathcal{D}' \in \text{Per}_\epsilon(\mathcal{D}). \text{VRA}(F, \mathcal{D}) \leq \text{Acc}(F, \mathcal{D}')$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{D}' be an arbitrary distribution from $\text{Per}_\epsilon(\mathcal{D})$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Acc}(F, \mathcal{D}') \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}'} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x)=F^*(x)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, \delta \sim \text{Adv}(x)} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x+\delta)=F^*(x+\delta)}] \text{ (Definition of } \mathcal{D}') \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, \delta \sim \text{Adv}(x)} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x+\delta)=F^*(x)}] \text{ (} F^* \text{ is locally robust)} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [\min_{\delta \in B_\epsilon} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x+\delta)=F^*(x)}]] \text{ (Worst-case perturbation)} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x)=F^*(x) \wedge C_\epsilon^F(x)=1}] \\ &= \text{VRA}(F, \mathcal{D}) \end{aligned}$$

□

⁵ $\text{Acc}(F, \mathcal{D}) := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [\mathbb{1}_{F(x)=F^*(x)}]$

Theorem 5.3 states that the VRA of the model gives a lower bound on the expected accuracy in the presence of a norm-bounded adversary. No matter how the adversary perturbs the samples, the accuracy of the model can never be worse than the VRA on the original distribution. This result holds under a mild assumption about the data distribution \mathcal{D} and the ground-truth labeling function F^* . The assumption states that every pair of points in the support of \mathcal{D} with different ground-truth labels are separated by at least 2ϵ and furthermore, the ground-truth labeling function is ϵ -locally robust at every such point in the support of \mathcal{D} . The ϵ -separability assumption is empirically well-motivated (Yang et al., 2020b); in fact, if this assumption is not true, then there is always an inherent trade-off between robustness and accuracy of the model. The second part of the assumption is a basic motivation for aiming to learn robust classifiers and is feasible due to the ϵ -separability of \mathcal{D} .

In contrast, when using empirical defenses, one measures the percentage of points in the held-out dataset where the model is accurate and not susceptible to misclassification subjected to a *fixed* set of attacks, often referred to as the Empirical Robust Accuracy of the model ($\overline{\text{ERA}}$). However, $\overline{\text{ERA}}$ and its corresponding version in expectation, i.e., ERA, can only guarantee model accuracy with respect to the fixed set of attacks considered but not with respect to any norm-bounded adversary.

Note that the theorem relates VRA with the accuracy of the model on perturbed samples but we are only able to measure $\overline{\text{VRA}}$. However, $\overline{\text{VRA}}$ and VRA are related via standard statistical results such as Hoeffding’s Inequality.

Inference-time Certification A model with inference-time certification takes the following form,

$$F^\perp(x) := \text{if } (C_\epsilon^F(x) = 1) \text{ then } F(x) \text{ else } \perp$$

where F is the model and C_ϵ^F is the local robustness certification procedure. Consider the case where C_ϵ^F returns 1, i.e., the model is certified ϵ -locally robust at x . In this case, even if x is an adversarially perturbed input, we are guaranteed that the model prediction at x is the same as the original unperturbed input. In this sense, no matter how the norm-bounded adversary generated the perturbed input x , the certification guarantees that the model is unaffected by the adversarial intervention whenever the check passes⁶. In contrast, an empirical check of ϵ -local robustness or any other inference-time empirical defense based on “purifying” or modifying the input before the model accesses it (Croce et al., 2022; Frosio & Kautz, 2023) cannot guarantee that the model prediction is unaffected by an adversary. Theorem 5.4 formally expresses this guarantee.

Theorem 5.4 (Inference-time Certification). *Given a model F^\perp with inference-time certification, the following holds $\forall x \in X$,*

$$F^\perp(x) \neq \perp \implies x \text{ is not an adversarial example.}$$

Proof. Assume $F^\perp(x) \neq \perp$. Then, by definition of F^\perp and C_ϵ^F , $\forall x' \in X. \|x - x'\|_p \leq \epsilon \implies F(x) = F(x')$. Since our adversary is norm-bounded, the original unperturbed input x'' has to satisfy the property that $\|x'' - x\|_p \leq \epsilon$. Therefore, it follows that $F(x) = F(x'')$, i.e., x is classified in the same way as the original input and is therefore not an adversarial example. \square

Note that inference-time certification requires the certifier to be highly efficient. While techniques based on smoothing and sampling, constraint solving, linear relaxations, and semi-definite programming are too expensive to be used at inference-time, Lipschitz-based certifiers are ideally suited for this purpose since the global Lipschitz constant of the model can be calculated offline.

5.3. Accuracy, Robustness, and Certification

While robustness certification can resolve the cat-and-mouse game played between norm-bounded attackers and defenders, one may contend that it is unclear at what cost this comes. Statements made consistently throughout the literature over the years (Fawzi et al., 2018; Tsipras et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019a) suggest that a common belief is that accuracy, robustness, and sound certification are in conflict with one another, such that an inherent trade-off is induced. However, in this section we present an alternate view. First, under reasonable distributional assumptions, there is no conflict between accuracy and local robustness. Moreover, a recent result (Leino, 2023) shows that within the certified training paradigm, we can hope to steer the model towards one that is not only accurate and robust, but also efficient to certify (via a Lipschitz check), provided our hypothesis class has sufficient capacity (Leino, 2023). Finally, in light of these observations, we argue that

⁶A failure of the check does not come with any guarantee, and can, in fact, be exploited by an adversary to degrade model utility (Leino et al., 2022b)

Lipschitz-based certified training may be the most effective path forward for learning high-performance robust models, and thus merits further research attention.

Accuracy and Robustness Much of the literature references, directly or implicitly, a robustness-accuracy trade-off (Fawzi et al., 2018; Tsipras et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019a). Tsipras et al. (2019) formalize this notion, showing a theoretical trade-off between “standard” and robust accuracy in a simple Gaussian setting. However, it is not clear that the distributional assumptions of Tsipras et al. (Tsipras et al., 2019) are reasonable in any situation where we would hope for robustness. Notably, under these distributional assumptions, the data are not separable. This seems clearly problematic, as two in-distribution (natural) points may be arbitrarily close to one another (even identical), but have different ground-truth labels; while implicit in the notion of robustness—even the most general notion of “semantic” robustness—is the assumption that the ground truth is robust. After all, adversarial examples are meant to cause misclassifications, not arbitrary alternations between equally valid labels.

Yang et al. (2020b) have argued that ϵ -separability (Definition 5.2) is a more reasonable assumption in the context of robustness. Crucially, ϵ -separability ensures that adversarial examples with respect to the ground truth are not within the support of the distribution. This is a natural requirement, which holds empirically on standard datasets (Yang et al., 2020b); and it is clear that under this distributional assumption, no accuracy-robustness trade-off exists.

On the Incompleteness of Efficient Certification State-of-the-art (in terms of maximum $\overline{\text{VRA}}$ achieved) certification procedures are *incomplete*, using certified training techniques to amplify the effectiveness of efficient robustness checks. As discussed in Section 5.1, the fact that complete certification is NP-complete leaves little hope that complete procedures will ever be practical on the large-scale neural networks used in many real-world applications. This raises the natural question: *at some point, won't the incompleteness of leading approaches compromise the model's performance?* If so, one may have to contend with whether or not the strong guarantees robustness provides are worthwhile.

Note that there are two concerns here. The first is that a model may be robust, but not all points will be certifiable, causing us to underestimate its robust performance, and falsely flag robust points at inference time. The second is that when using an incomplete certification as part of a certified training procedure, the learned model will become over-regularized damaging its true robustness (certified or not) and accuracy.

While both of these are valid concerns, when we consider the context of certified training, the picture becomes less bleak. When the certifier has control over the model's parameters during training, it is pertinent to ask not whether *all* functions within the hypothesis class can be tightly certified (corresponding to completeness), but rather, whether it is possible to learn a function that (1) is robust on the distribution of interest, and (2) can be tightly certified. Perhaps surprisingly, a result of Leino (2023) shows that for any ϵ -separated data distribution, there always exists a function that achieves both of these goals, using a simple Lipschitz check to *tightly* decide the robustness all points. This function has the property that the exact distance to the decision boundary (i.e., the robustness radius) is always equal to Δ/κ , where Δ is the minimum margin between the logit value of the predicted class and any other logit value, and κ is the function's global Lipschitz constant, which is (on this function) everywhere the same as its local Lipschitz constant. This means it can be trivially certified at inference time using a bound on the global Lipschitz constant.

The existence of such an “ideally robust” function does not directly suggest that it is easy, or even practical, to learn such a function, however. In fact, Leino points to the fact that approximating this ideally robust function using the standard piece-wise linear hypothesis class requires excess capacity beyond what would be required to learn a boundary that is technically robust (but not certifiable)—and this is in addition to the practical challenges around training dynamics and Lipschitz estimation. Nonetheless, we believe that the existence of the ideally robust function should inspire hope that Lipschitz-based certified training has a great deal of potential to minimize the trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and efficient certification. Indeed, even now, certified training approaches based on global Lipschitz-based certification have emerged thus far as the clear leaders for state-of-the-art $\overline{\text{VRA}}$ (Hu et al., 2023a).

The Power of Lipschitz-controlled Training As discussed, the limitations which may lead to a trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and certification are not as fundamental as one might initially believe. Let us discuss this point further, as it relates to the motivation for studying robustness certification.

Specifically, we would like to draw more attention to the recent success and progress of Lipschitz-based certification. Within just the last few years, the state-of-the-art deterministic VRA, led by Lipschitz based methods, e.g., (Leino et al., 2021;




Figure 5: The gap between the reported SOTA \overline{ACC} and SOTA \overline{VRA} (measured locally in a ℓ_2 -ball with $\epsilon = 36/255$) on several vision datasets.

Trockman & Kolter, 2021; Hu et al., 2023b;a; Singla & Feizi, 2021), has increased by a factor of over 50% on benchmark datasets like CIFAR-10; and certification has become possible on large datasets (like ImageNet) and architectures (like deep ResNets) (Hu et al., 2023b). Figure 5 illustrates this progress, specifically in terms of closing the gap between accuracy and verified robust accuracy. There is a strong empirical and theoretical basis for believing that these strides should hope to continue; we therefore contend that it is worth exploring further in this direction to build on the tremendous progress.

A Way Forward for Robustness via Lipschitz-based Methods Although the power of Lipschitz-based certification is supported theoretically, and has thus far been borne out empirically, our bullishness on this approach’s future prospects deserves closer examination. A series of studies find, either empirically or theoretically, that robust models require more capacity (Schmidt et al., 2018; Bubeck et al., 2021; Li & Li, 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Altstidl et al., 2023), particularly in the context of certification. However, for certifiable models, especially those certified using Lipschitz-based methods, increasing the model capacity is not trivial.

To obtain satisfactory certification performance using Lipschitz-based training methods, it is crucial to design network architectures with easy-to-compute and tight Lipschitz bounds. This is a challenge in and of itself, but it also specifically complicates capacity-scaling.

One common approach to adding capacity is by adding depth to the network, but this is challenging for Lipschitz-based methods, as the bound for the entire network is typically computed as a product of the layer-wise Lipschitz bounds, meaning that any looseness compounds multiplicatively with each layer. Furthermore, deep models typically use residual architectures, but a naive bound on the Lipschitz constant of residual blocks is unfortunately loose (Hu et al., 2023b). Hu et al. (2023b) proposed using a linear residual branch so that the Lipschitz bound for the residual block can be tight, showing that this method can obtain non-trivial deterministic certification on ImageNet. However, linear residual blocks are less expressive than non-linear residual blocks.

The requirement for Lipschitzness, also renders traditional attention-based architectures as out-of-scope since they do not have a Lipschitz bound. Although some work (Kim et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2023) proposes to modify the attention mechanism to make it Lipschitz, so far attention-based mechanisms have not been shown to outperform basic ResNet architectures (Hu et al., 2023b). Nonetheless, exploring transformer-like building blocks with tight Lipschitz bounds remains an interesting research direction. Models using such blocks may benefit from the high capacity from Transformer-like design, and bridge the gap between VRA and standard accuracy (ACC) for visual models. Additionally, “Lipschitz transformers” could open the door for providing certain security guarantees for LLMs, which have recently gained massive attention from the machine learning community as well as the general public.

6. Conclusion

Though a tremendous amount of research has been produced over the last decade on adversarial robustness with respect to norm-bounded adversaries, the impact of this research in practice remains unclear. In light of this situation, we revisit some basic underlying motivations driving this research and argue for the position that robustness research with respect to norm-bounded adversaries, particularly research on certified defenses, continues to be practically worthwhile and technically challenging. We clarify that certification can mean different things at different stages of learning pipeline and formalize the guarantees granted by certification at these different stages. With this, we hope to bring clarity and structure to the ongoing, almost decade-long, conversation on certified robustness, and provide insight as to which directions remain fruitful. We also clarify that, under realistic distributional assumptions, there is no inherent trade-off between accuracy, robustness, and efficient certifiability, suggesting that certified models stand a hopeful chance of being able to satisfy the many requirements that would be necessary for adoption into real-world applications. Finally, to this end, we propose specifically that certified training incorporating Lipschitz-based certification may offer the most promising path towards learning an ideal function that is accurate, robust, and certifiable.

References

- <https://nicholas.carlini.com/writing/2019/all-adversarial-example-papers.html>.
- Altstidl, T., Dobre, D., Eskofier, B., Gidel, G., and Schwinn, L. Raising the bar for certified adversarial robustness with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10388*, 2023.
- Andriushchenko, M., Croce, F., Flammarion, N., and Hein, M. Square attack: a query-efficient black-box adversarial attack via random search. In *European conference on computer vision*, pp. 484–501. Springer, 2020.
- Araujo, A., Havens, A. J., Delattre, B., Allauzen, A., and Hu, B. A unified algebraic perspective on lipschitz neural networks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=k71IGLC8cfc>.
- Bak, S., Liu, C., and Johnson, T. The second international verification of neural networks competition (vnn-comp 2021): Summary and results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00498*, 2021.
- Balunovic, M., Baader, M., Singh, G., Gehr, T., and Vechev, M. Certifying geometric robustness of neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*. 2019.
- Behrmann, J., Grathwohl, W., Chen, R. T., Duvenaud, D., and Jacobsen, J.-H. Invertible residual networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 573–582. PMLR, 2019.
- Bitterwolf, J., Meinke, A., and Hein, M. Certifiably adversarially robust detection of out-of-distribution data. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 16085–16095. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/b90c46963248e6d7aab1e0f429743ca0-Paper.pdf.
- Brix, C., Müller, M. N., Bak, S., Johnson, T. T., and Liu, C. First three years of the international verification of neural networks competition (vnn-comp). *International Journal on Software Tools for Technology Transfer*, pp. 1–11, 2023.
- Bubeck, S., Li, Y., and Nagaraj, D. M. A law of robustness for two-layers neural networks. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 804–820. PMLR, 2021.
- Bunel, R., Mudigonda, P., Turkaslan, I., Torr, P., Lu, J., and Kohli, P. Branch and bound for piecewise linear neural network verification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(2020), 2020.
- Calinescu, R., Imrie, C., Mangal, R., Rodrigues, G. N., Pășăreanu, C., Santana, M. A., and Vázquez, G. Discrete-event controller synthesis for autonomous systems with deep-learning perception components. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03360*, 2022.
- Carlini, N. and Wagner, D. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 39–57. Ieee, 2017.

- Carlini, N., Athalye, A., Papernot, N., Brendel, W., Rauber, J., Tsipras, D., Goodfellow, I., Madry, A., and Kurakin, A. On evaluating adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06705*, 2019.
- Carlini, N., Tramer, F., Kolter, J. Z., et al. (certified!!) adversarial robustness for free! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10550*, 2022.
- Carlini, N., Nasr, M., Choquette-Choo, C. A., Jagielski, M., Gao, I., Awadalla, A., Koh, P. W., Ippolito, D., Lee, K., Tramer, F., et al. Are aligned neural networks adversarially aligned? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15447*, 2023.
- Chen, T., Liu, S., Chang, S., Cheng, Y., Amini, L., and Wang, Z. Adversarial robustness: From self-supervised pre-training to fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 699–708, 2020.
- Cohen, J., Rosenfeld, E., and Kolter, Z. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In *international conference on machine learning*, pp. 1310–1320. PMLR, 2019.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Minimally distorted adversarial examples with a fast adaptive boundary attack. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2196–2205. PMLR, 2020a.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2206–2216. PMLR, 2020b.
- Croce, F., Andriushchenko, M., Sehwag, V., Debenedetti, E., Flammarion, N., Chiang, M., Mittal, P., and Hein, M. Robustbench: a standardized adversarial robustness benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09670*, 2020.
- Croce, F., Gowal, S., Brunner, T., Shelhamer, E., Hein, M., and Cemgil, T. Evaluating the adversarial robustness of adaptive test-time defenses. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4421–4435. PMLR, 2022.
- Dathathri, S., Dvijotham, K., Kurakin, A., Raghunathan, A., Uesato, J., Bunel, R. R., Shankar, S., Steinhardt, J., Goodfellow, I., Liang, P. S., et al. Enabling certification of verification-agnostic networks via memory-efficient semidefinite programming. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:5318–5331, 2020.
- Deng, Z., Zhang, L., Vodrahalli, K., Kawaguchi, K., and Zou, J. Y. Adversarial training helps transfer learning via better representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25179–25191, 2021.
- Dumont, B., Maggio, S., and Montalvo, P. Robustness of rotation-equivariant networks to adversarial perturbations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06627*, 2018.
- Dvijotham, K., Stanforth, R., Gowal, S., Mann, T. A., and Kohli, P. A dual approach to scalable verification of deep networks. In *UAI*, volume 1, pp. 3, 2018.
- Etmann, C., Lunz, S., Maass, P., and Schönlieb, C.-B. On the connection between adversarial robustness and saliency map interpretability. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:150374025>.
- Eykholt, K., Evtimov, I., Fernandes, E., Li, B., Rahmati, A., Xiao, C., Prakash, A., Kohno, T., and Song, D. Robust physical-world attacks on deep learning visual classification. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 1625–1634, 2018. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2018.00175.
- Fawzi, A., Fawzi, O., and Frossard, P. Analysis of classifiers’ robustness to adversarial perturbations. *Machine learning*, 107(3):481–508, 2018.
- Fazlyab, M., Morari, M., and Pappas, G. J. Safety verification and robustness analysis of neural networks via quadratic constraints and semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(1):1–15, 2020.
- Frei, S., Vardi, G., Bartlett, P. L., and Srebro, N. The double-edged sword of implicit bias: Generalization vs. robustness in relu networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Frosio, I. and Kautz, J. The best defense is a good offense: Adversarial augmentation against adversarial attacks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 4067–4076, 2023.

- Gavrikov, P., Keuper, J., and Keuper, M. An extended study of human-like behavior under adversarial training. *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pp. 2361–2368, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257663581>.
- Gilmer, J., Adams, R. P., Goodfellow, I., Andersen, D., and Dahl, G. E. Motivating the rules of the game for adversarial example research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06732*, 2018.
- Goodfellow, I., Shlens, J., and Szegedy, C. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6572>.
- Gowal, S., Dvijotham, K., Stanforth, R., Bunel, R., Qin, C., Uesato, J., Arandjelovic, R., Mann, T., and Kohli, P. On the effectiveness of interval bound propagation for training verifiably robust models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12715*, 2018a.
- Gowal, S., Dvijotham, K., Stanforth, R., Bunel, R., Qin, C., Uesato, J., Arandjelović, R., Mann, T. A., and Kohli, P. On the effectiveness of interval bound propagation for training verifiably robust models. *ArXiv*, abs/1810.12715, 2018b. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:53112003>.
- Hao, Z., Ying, C., Dong, Y., Su, H., Song, J., and Zhu, J. Gsmooth: Certified robustness against semantic transformations via generalized randomized smoothing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8465–8483. PMLR, 2022.
- Hendrycks, D., Mu, N., Cubuk, E. D., Zoph, B., Gilmer, J., and Lakshminarayanan, B. AugMix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Critch, A., Li, J., Song, D., and Steinhardt, J. Aligning ai with shared human values. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021a.
- Hendrycks, D., Carlini, N., Schulman, J., and Steinhardt, J. Unsolved problems in ml safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13916*, 2021b.
- Hendrycks, D., Mazeika, M., and Woodside, T. An overview of catastrophic ai risks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12001*, 2023.
- Hou, B., Jia, J., Zhang, Y., Zhang, G., Zhang, Y., Liu, S., and Chang, S. Textgrad: Advancing robustness evaluation in NLP by gradient-driven optimization. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5tKXUZi13X>.
- Hsiung, L., Tsai, Y.-Y., Chen, P.-Y., and Ho, T.-Y. Towards Compositional Adversarial Robustness: Generalizing Adversarial Training to Composite Semantic Perturbations. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*. IEEE, June 2023.
- Hu, K., Leino, K., Wang, Z., and Fredrikson, M. A recipe for improved certifiable robustness: Capacity and data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02513*, 2023a.
- Hu, K., Zou, A., Wang, Z., Leino, K., and Fredrikson, M. Scaling in depth: Unlocking robustness certification on imagenet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12549*, 2023b.
- Hussain, S., Neekhara, P., Dubnov, S., McAuley, J., and Koushanfar, F. {WaveGuard}: Understanding and mitigating audio adversarial examples. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pp. 2273–2290, 2021.
- Ilyas, A., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Engstrom, L., Tran, B., and Madry, A. Adversarial examples are not bugs, they are features. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Jeong, J., Park, S., Kim, M., Lee, H.-C., Kim, D.-G., and Shin, J. Smoothmix: Training confidence-calibrated smoothed classifiers for certified robustness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:30153–30168, 2021.
- Katz, G., Barrett, C., Dill, D. L., Julian, K., and Kochenderfer, M. J. Reluplex: An efficient smt solver for verifying deep neural networks. In *Computer Aided Verification: 29th International Conference, CAV 2017, Heidelberg, Germany, July 24-28, 2017, Proceedings, Part I 30*, pp. 97–117. Springer, 2017.

- Katz, G., Huang, D. A., Ibeling, D., Julian, K., Lazarus, C., Lim, R., Shah, P., Thakoor, S., Wu, H., Zeljić, A., et al. The marabou framework for verification and analysis of deep neural networks. In *Computer Aided Verification: 31st International Conference, CAV 2019, New York City, NY, USA, July 15-18, 2019, Proceedings, Part I 31*, pp. 443–452. Springer, 2019.
- Kim, H., Papamakarios, G., and Mnih, A. The lipschitz constant of self-attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5562–5571. PMLR, 2021.
- Kojima, T., Gu, S. S., Reid, M., Matsuo, Y., and Iwasawa, Y. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 22199–22213, 2022.
- Leino, K. Identifying, analyzing, and addressing weaknesses in deep networks: Foundations for conceptually sound neural networks, 2022.
- Leino, K. Limitations of piecewise linearity for efficient robustness certification, 2023.
- Leino, K., Wang, Z., and Fredrikson, M. Globally-robust neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 6212–6222. PMLR, 2021.
- Leino, K., Helland, J., Vijaykumar, S., Sinha, A., VanHoudnos, N., and Fredrikson, M. Robust features can leak instances and their properties, 2022a.
- Leino, K., Zhang, C., Mangal, R., Fredrikson, M., Parno, B., and Pasareanu, C. Degradation attacks on certifiably robust neural networks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022b. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=P0XO5ZE98j>.
- Li, B. and Li, Y. Why clean generalization and robust overfitting both happen in adversarial training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01271*, 2023.
- Li, L., Xie, T., and Li, B. Sok: Certified robustness for deep neural networks. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 1289–1310. IEEE, 2023.
- Lin, W.-A., Lau, C. P., Levine, A., Chellappa, R., and Feizi, S. Dual manifold adversarial robustness: Defense against ℓ_p and non- ℓ_p adversarial attacks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3487–3498, 2020.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJzIBfZAb>.
- Mangal, R. and Pasareanu, C. S. A cascade of checkers for run-time certification of local robustness. In Isac, O., Ivanov, R., Katz, G., Narodytska, N., and Nenzi, L. (eds.), *Software Verification and Formal Methods for ML-Enabled Autonomous Systems - 5th International Workshop, FoMLAS 2022, and 15th International Workshop, NSV 2022, Haifa, Israel, July 31 - August 1, and August 11, 2022, Proceedings*, volume 13466 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 15–28. Springer, 2022. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-21222-2_2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21222-2_2.
- Mao, C., Zhong, Z., Yang, J., Vondrick, C., and Ray, B. Metric learning for adversarial robustness. In Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Beygelzimer, A., d'Alché-Buc, F., Fox, E., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/c24cd76e1ce41366a4bbe8a49b02a028-Paper.pdf.
- Maus, N., Chao, P., Wong, E., and Gardner, J. Adversarial prompting for black box foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04237*, 2023.
- Morawiecki, P., Spurek, P., Śmieja, M., and Tabor, J. Fast and stable interval bounds propagation for training verifiably robust models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00628*, 2019.
- Naseer, M., Khan, S., Hayat, M., Khan, F. S., and Porikli, F. A self-supervised approach for adversarial robustness. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 262–271, 2020.

- Neyshabur, B., Bhojanapalli, S., Mcallester, D., and Srebro, N. Exploring generalization in deep learning. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/10ce03aled01077e3e289f3e53c72813-Paper.pdf.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Pang, T., Xu, K., Dong, Y., Du, C., Chen, N., and Zhu, J. Rethinking softmax cross-entropy loss for adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10626*, 2019a.
- Pang, T., Xu, K., Du, C., Chen, N., and Zhu, J. Improving adversarial robustness via promoting ensemble diversity. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4970–4979. PMLR, 2019b.
- Păsăreanu, C. S., Mangal, R., Gopinath, D., Getir Yaman, S., Imrie, C., Calinescu, R., and Yu, H. Closed-loop analysis of vision-based autonomous systems: A case study. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pp. 289–303. Springer, 2023.
- Pulina, L. and Tacchella, A. An abstraction-refinement approach to verification of artificial neural networks. In *Computer Aided Verification: 22nd International Conference, CAV 2010, Edinburgh, UK, July 15-19, 2010. Proceedings 22*, pp. 243–257. Springer, 2010.
- Raghuathan, A., Steinhardt, J., and Liang, P. Certified defenses against adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Rebuffi, S.-A., Goyal, S., Calian, D. A., Stimberg, F., Wiles, O., and Mann, T. Fixing data augmentation to improve adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01946*, 2021.
- Salman, H., Yang, G., Zhang, H., Hsieh, C.-J., and Zhang, P. A convex relaxation barrier to tight robustness verification of neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Salman, H., Ilyas, A., Engstrom, L., Kapoor, A., and Madry, A. Do adversarially robust imagenet models transfer better? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3533–3545, 2020.
- Schmidt, L., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Talwar, K., and Madry, A. Adversarially robust generalization requires more data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Setlur, A., Eysenbach, B., Smith, V., and Levine, S. Adversarial unlearning: Reducing confidence along adversarial directions. In Oh, A. H., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., and Cho, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=cJ006qBE8Uv>.
- Sharif, M., Bhagavatula, S., Bauer, L., and Reiter, M. K. Accessorize to a crime: Real and stealthy attacks on state-of-the-art face recognition. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, October 2016. doi: 10.1145/2976749.2978392. URL <https://www.ece.cmu.edu/~lbauer/papers/2016/ccs2016-face-recognition.pdf>.
- Sharif, M., Bhagavatula, S., Bauer, L., and Reiter, M. K. Adversarial Generative Nets: Neural network attacks on state-of-the-art face recognition. *arXiv preprint 1801.00349*, December 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.00349>.
- Shi, Z., Jin, Q., Kolter, J. Z., Jana, S., Hsieh, C.-J., and Zhang, H. Formal verification for neural networks with general nonlinearities via branch-and-bound. *2nd Workshop on Formal Verification of Machine Learning (WFVML 2023)*, 2023.
- Singh, G., Gehr, T., Püschel, M., and Vechev, M. An abstract domain for certifying neural networks. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3(POPL):1–30, 2019.
- Singla, S. and Feizi, S. Skew orthogonal convolutions. In Meila, M. and Zhang, T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 9756–9766. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.

- Szegedy, C., Zaremba, W., Sutskever, I., Bruna, J., Erhan, D., Goodfellow, I., and Fergus, R. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- Tjeng, V., Xiao, K., and Tedrake, R. Evaluating robustness of neural networks with mixed integer programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.07356*, 2017.
- Tramer, F. Detecting adversarial examples is (Nearly) as hard as classifying them. In Chaudhuri, K., Jegelka, S., Song, L., Szepesvari, C., Niu, G., and Sabato, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 21692–21702. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/tramer22a.html>.
- Tramèr, F., Kurakin, A., Papernot, N., Goodfellow, I., Boneh, D., and McDaniel, P. Ensemble adversarial training: Attacks and defenses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07204*, 2017.
- Tramèr, F., Dupré, P., Rusak, G., Pellegrino, G., and Boneh, D. Adversarial: Perceptual ad blocking meets adversarial machine learning. *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:67855958>.
- Trockman, A. and Kolter, J. Z. Orthogonalizing convolutional layers with the cayley transform. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- Tsai, Y.-T., Yang, M.-C., and Chen, H.-Y. Adversarial attack on sentiment classification. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pp. 233–240, Florence, Italy, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W19-4824. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W19-4824>.
- Tsipras, D., Santurkar, S., Engstrom, L., Turner, A., and Madry, A. Robustness may be at odds with accuracy. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SyxAb30cY7>.
- Uesato, J., O’Donoghue, B., Kohli, P., and van den Oord, A. Adversarial risk and the dangers of evaluating against weak attacks. In Dy, J. and Krause, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5025–5034. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/uesato18a.html>.
- Vardi, G., Yehudai, G., and Shamir, O. Gradient methods provably converge to non-robust networks. In Oh, A. H., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., and Cho, K. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XDZhagjfMP>.
- Wang, R., Yang, Y., and Tao, D. Art-point: Improving rotation robustness of point cloud classifiers via adversarial rotation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 14371–14380, 2022a.
- Wang, S., Pei, K., Whitehouse, J., Yang, J., and Jana, S. Efficient formal safety analysis of neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Wang, S., Zhang, H., Xu, K., Lin, X., Jana, S., Hsieh, C.-J., and Kolter, J. Z. Beta-CROWN: Efficient bound propagation with per-neuron split constraints for neural network robustness verification. In Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ahYI1RBeCFw>.
- Wang, Z. On the Feature Alignment of Deep Vision Models: Explainability and Robustness Connected At Hip. 9 2023. doi: 10.1184/R1/24026334.v1. URL https://kilthub.cmu.edu/articles/thesis/On_the_Feature_Alignment_of_Deep_Vision_Models_Explainability_and_Robustness_Connected_At_Hip/24026334.
- Wang, Z., Fredrikson, M., and Datta, A. Robust models are more interpretable because attributions look normal. In Chaudhuri, K., Jegelka, S., Song, L., Szepesvari, C., Niu, G., and Sabato, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 22625–22651. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022b. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/wang22e.html>.

- Wang, Z., Pang, T., Du, C., Lin, M., Liu, W., and Yan, S. Better diffusion models further improve adversarial training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- Wei, A., Haghtalab, N., and Steinhardt, J. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02483*, 2023.
- Weng, L., Zhang, H., Chen, H., Song, Z., Hsieh, C.-J., Daniel, L., Boning, D., and Dhillon, I. Towards fast computation of certified robustness for relu networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5276–5285. PMLR, 2018.
- Wong, E., Schmidt, F., Metzen, J. H., and Kolter, J. Z. Scaling provable adversarial defenses. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Wu, H., Tagomori, T., Robey, A., Yang, F., Matni, N., Pappas, G., Hassani, H., Pasareanu, C., and Barrett, C. Toward certified robustness against real-world distribution shifts. In *2023 IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning (SaTML)*, pp. 537–553. IEEE, 2023.
- Xiao, C., Chen, Z., Jin, K., Wang, J., Nie, W., Liu, M., Anandkumar, A., Li, B., and Song, D. Densepure: Understanding diffusion models for adversarial robustness. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Xie, C., Tan, M., Gong, B., Wang, J., Yuille, A., and Le, Q. V. Adversarial examples improve image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09665*, 2020.
- Xu, K., Zhang, G., Liu, S., Fan, Q., Sun, M., Chen, H., Chen, P.-Y., Wang, Y., and Lin, X. Adversarial t-shirt! evading person detectors in a physical world. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part V 16*, pp. 665–681. Springer, 2020.
- Xu, X., Li, L., Cheng, Y., Mukherjee, S., Awadallah, A. H., and Li, B. Certifiably robust transformers with 1-lipschitz self-attention, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hzG72qB0XQ>.
- Yang, G., Duan, T., Hu, J. E., Salman, H., Razenshteyn, I. P., and Li, J. Randomized smoothing of all shapes and sizes. 2020a.
- Yang, R., Laurel, J., Misailovic, S., and Singh, G. Provable defense against geometric transformations. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ThXqBsRI-cY>.
- Yang, Y.-Y., Rashtchian, C., Zhang, H., Salakhutdinov, R. R., and Chaudhuri, K. A closer look at accuracy vs. robustness. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:8588–8601, 2020b.
- Zhang, H., Weng, T.-W., Chen, P.-Y., Hsieh, C.-J., and Daniel, L. Efficient neural network robustness certification with general activation functions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Zhang, H., Yu, Y., Jiao, J., Xing, E., El Ghaoui, L., and Jordan, M. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 7472–7482. PMLR, 2019a.
- Zhang, H., Yu, Y., Jiao, J., Xing, E. P., Ghaoui, L. E., and Jordan, M. I. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. *ArXiv*, abs/1901.08573, 2019b. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59222747>.
- Zhong, J., Liu, X., and Hsieh, C.-J. Improving the speed and quality of gan by adversarial training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.03364*, 2020.
- Zhou, M. and Patel, V. M. Enhancing adversarial robustness for deep metric learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 15325–15334, 2022.
- Ziegler, D. M., Stiennon, N., Wu, J., Brown, T. B., Radford, A., Amodei, D., Christiano, P., and Irving, G. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.
- Zou, A., Wang, Z., Kolter, J. Z., and Fredrikson, M. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.