

DISTILLING ADVERSARIAL ROBUSTNESS USING HETEROGENEOUS TEACHERS

Jieren Deng, Aaron Palmer, Rigel Mahmood, Ethan Rathbun, Jinbo Bi,
Kaleel Mahmood, Derek Aguiar

University of Connecticut

{jieren.deng, aaron.palmer, rigel.mahmood, ethan.rathbun, jinbo.bi, kaleel.mahmood,
derek.aguiar}@uconn.edu,

Abstract

Achieving resiliency against adversarial attacks is necessary prior to deploying neural network classifiers in domains where misclassification incurs substantial costs, e.g. self-driving cars or medical imaging. Recent work has demonstrated that robustness can be transferred from an adversarially trained teacher to a student model using knowledge distillation. However, current methods perform distillation using a single adversarial and vanilla teacher and consider homogeneous architectures (i.e., CNNs) that are susceptible to misclassify examples from similar adversarial subspaces. In this work, we develop a defense framework against adversarial attacks by distilling adversarial robustness using heterogeneous teachers (DARHT), where teachers are different with respect to architecture or adversarial training algorithm. In DARHT, the student model explicitly represents teacher logits in a student-teacher feature map and leverages multiple teachers that exhibit low adversarial example transferability (i.e., robust to different adversarial subspaces). Experiments on classification tasks in both white-box and black-box scenarios demonstrate that DARHT exhibits state-of-the-art performance; in particular, DARHT achieved at least 3.26%, 3.66%, and 25.75% improvements in weighted robust accuracy for Auto-PGD and 5.23%, 4.76%, and 22.83% for Square Attack when compared to competing adversarial distillation methods in the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Tiny ImageNet datasets, respectively. Comparisons between homogeneous and heterogeneous teacher sets suggest that leveraging teachers with low adversarial example transferability increases student model robustness.

1 Introduction

As deep learning is deployed for an increasing variety of applications, the threat posed by adversarial examples becomes ever more prevalent. Machine learning classifiers (in particular deep neural networks) are especially vulnerable [Szegedy *et al.*, 2013; Mahmood *et al.*, 2022]. The conse-

quences for misclassification in response to adversarial perturbation can be substantial in applications where safety is paramount [Dalvi *et al.*, 2004], including sensor attacks on self-driving cars [Cao *et al.*, 2019] and misclassification of disease states from medical imaging [Finlayson *et al.*, 2019]. Thus, achieving resiliency against adversarial attacks is essential before deploying machine learning in technologies that interface with humans.

In general, there are two ways in which adversarial attacks can be mitigated. First, provably robust *certified defenses* defend against attacks assuming that adversarial perturbations are bounded by a specified norm [Raghunathan *et al.*, 2018]. Second, attacks can be mitigated through the use of *empirical defenses* like adversarial training [Raff *et al.*, 2019; Madry *et al.*, 2018]. While strategies to circumvent some empirical defenses have demonstrated success [Tramer *et al.*, 2020], adversarial training techniques have shown a remarkable robustness to a diverse set of attacks. In this work, we focus on adversarial training [Zhang *et al.*, 2020], as it is widely considered to be one of the most effective empirical defenses [Madry *et al.*, 2018; Rice *et al.*, 2020]. Adversarial training posits a robust modified loss function, and then iteratively perturbs a randomly selected training sample to have large loss before updating model parameters during training [Bai *et al.*, 2021].

Recent work has demonstrated that knowledge distillation, which is typically used to train neural networks in resource constrained settings [Hinton *et al.*, 2015], can be used to transfer adversarial robustness to a student model. *Defensive distillation* uses the predicted probabilities of a sample from a teacher network as training labels for a distilled network to improve generalization performance [Papernot *et al.*, 2016]. In contrast, *adversarially robust distillation* minimizes a discrepancy between the teacher’s predicted class of an unperturbed example and the student’s prediction on the same example after adversarial perturbation [Goldblum *et al.*, 2020; Zhu *et al.*, 2022; Zi *et al.*, 2021]. Subsequent methods incorporated an adversarial and vanilla (i.e., not adversarially trained) teacher explicitly in the distillation loss function [Zhao *et al.*, 2022; Zi *et al.*, 2021]. Explanations for how adversarial knowledge is transferred appeal to leveraging inter-class correlations, encouraging predicted class probabilities with higher entropy by gradient scaling, label smoothing, and altering logit distributions [Furlanello *et al.*, 2018; Tang

et al., 2020; Phuong and Lampert, 2019; Seguin *et al.*, 2021].

In parallel to the developments in the field of adversarial knowledge distillation, another adversarial phenomena has been well documented, which is denoted as *adversarial transferability* [Liu *et al.*, 2016; Mahmood *et al.*, 2021; Xu *et al.*, 2022]. In this context transferability refers to the fact that models with similar architectures (e.g. two convolutional neural networks – CNNs) often misclassify the same adversarial example. Adversarial examples span contiguous regions, or adversarial subspaces [Goodfellow *et al.*, 2015], and high transferability between two models can be explained by the extent to which these subspaces intersect. While transferability exists in adversarial defense and distillation scenarios [Papernot *et al.*, 2016], models with different architectures (e.g. a CNN and vision transformer) do not misclassify the same set of adversarial examples when the samples are generated using single model white-box attacks like FGSM [Goodfellow *et al.*, 2015], PGD [Madry *et al.*, 2018] or CW_∞ [Carlini and Wagner, 2017]. This raises an important question: *can teachers with diverse architectures provide better robustness in the knowledge distillation setting?*

In this work, we introduce a defense framework against white-box adversarial attacks by distilling adversarial robustness using heterogeneous teachers (DARHT; Fig. 1). Unlike prior work, DARHT leverages both adversarially trained and vanilla teacher models that exhibit low adversarial transferability. The student model explicitly represents the teacher logits, whose properties have been shown to be valuable for adversarial robustness [Seguin *et al.*, 2021], in a *student-teacher feature map*. DARHT accommodates heterogeneous teachers by learning weights for each individual student-teacher feature and avoids expensive per-teacher hyperparameter tuning by weighing a specific teacher’s distillation loss by the inverse of its cross-entropy loss. In total, our work makes the following contributions:

- We develop DARHT, the first approach for adversarial knowledge distillation with multiple heterogeneous teachers¹.
- We show that using teacher models that exhibit low adversarial transferability (or low adversarial subspace intersection [Tramèr *et al.*, 2017]) increases adversarial robustness of the student in a knowledge distillation setting, an effect we term *complementary robustness*.
- Extensive classification experiments in both white-box and black-box settings demonstrate that DARHT achieved at least 3.26%, 3.66%, and 25.75% improvements in weighted robust accuracy (the average of robust and clean accuracies) for Auto-PGD [Croce and Hein, 2020] and 5.23%, 4.76%, and 22.83% for Square Attack [Andriushchenko *et al.*, 2020] when compared to two state-of-the-art adversarial distillation approaches (RSLAD [Zi *et al.*, 2021] and MTARD [Zhao *et al.*, 2022]) in the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Tiny ImageNet datasets, respectively.

¹The source code for DARHT is available at <https://github.com/bayesomicslab/DARHT>.

- Further experiments demonstrate that robust and clean accuracies improve with (a) more teachers, (b) architecturally diverse teachers, and (c) teachers trained by different adversarial training algorithms.

2 Prior Work on Adversarial Distillation

Adversarial robustness can be distilled to a student model using an adversarially trained teacher [Bai *et al.*, 2020; Zhu *et al.*, 2022; Goldblum *et al.*, 2020; Chen *et al.*, 2020]. Adversarially robust distillation (ARD) showed that robust student models can be produced without adversarially training the student [Goldblum *et al.*, 2020]; namely, ARD reformulates the adversarial training minimization problem in Madry *et al.* [2018] to focus the student on reproducing the teacher outputs within a closed ball of radius ϵ . The Robust Soft Label Adversarial Distillation (RSLAD) method demonstrated improvements on ARD by incorporating robust soft labels (i.e., the softmax output of an adversarially trained teacher model) [Zi *et al.*, 2021]. While not producing the highest clean accuracy, RSLAD demonstrated higher robust accuracies when compared with ARD with respect to five attack algorithms. The Multi-Teacher Adversarial Robustness Distillation (MTARD) method distills knowledge from both an adversarially trained and a vanilla teacher [Zhao *et al.*, 2022, 2023]. By including a vanilla teacher in distillation, MTARD balances clean and robust accuracy, resulting in an improved weighted robust accuracy (W-Robust). However, while MTARD achieves high clean accuracy, it is seldom the most robust. MTARD also includes separate weight hyperparameters for the student and teacher models to balance robust and clean accuracies that require hyperparameter tuning.

3 DARHT Framework

In DARHT, the student explicitly *represents* teacher logits in a *student-teacher feature map* and combines a classification loss (Fig. 1, blue arrow) with a distillation loss (Fig. 1, green arrow) between the softmaxed student-teacher feature map and the softmaxed teacher logits for transferring adversarial robustness. In this section, we describe necessary notations and the core components of DARHT: logit-feature map knowledge distillation, teacher heterogeneity, Monte Carlo dropout, and the training algorithm.

Notation. We will consider classification problems with K classes. The student model, S_θ , is parameterized by θ and the set of teacher models is denoted by $T = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^J$. Applying the student model and teacher model T_j to an example x produces logit vectors $S_\theta(x)$ and $T_j(x)$ taking values in \mathbb{R}^K . *Logit-feature map distillation* is a function of the teacher logits and the student-teacher feature map, which is the student’s *representation* of the teacher’s logits. The full student-teacher feature map is $S_\theta^{(T)}(x) = \{S_\theta^{(T_j)}(x)\}_{j=1}^J$, where $S_\theta^{(T_j)}(x)$ represents the internal student-teacher feature map for the j^{th} teacher for all K classes.

Training the student model involves an outer minimization of the population risk [Madry *et al.*, 2018] where an adversarial example x_{adv} (with label y) is generated by adversarial training algorithm \mathcal{F} using a clean example x_{cln}




Figure 1: **Distilling adversarial robustness using heterogeneous teachers (DARHT)**. Adversarial examples are generated by applying an adversarial training algorithm to the clean examples using the student model. Subsequently, DARHT selects adversarial or clean examples as input for both the student model and heterogeneous teachers. The knowledge distillation loss ($\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$) is calculated using the teacher logits and the student-teacher feature map. The classification loss (\mathcal{L}_C) is computed as the cross-entropy between the student logits and the labels.

based on the student’s current θ , i.e. $x_{adv} = \mathcal{F}(\theta, x_{cln}, y)$. A forward pass through the student model produces the tuple $(S_{\theta}(x), S_{\theta}^{(T)}(x))$. The student objective is to minimize a combination of the classification distillation losses:

$$\arg \min_{\theta} \left(\mathcal{L}_C(S_{\theta}, x, y) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}(S_{\theta}^{(T)}, T, x) \right) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and \mathcal{L}_C respectively indicate the knowledge distillation and classification losses. The classification loss, \mathcal{L}_C , is defined as the cross-entropy between the softmaxed output of example x and one-hot encoded label y :

$$\mathcal{L}_C(S_{\theta}, x, y) = - \sum_{k=1}^K y_k \log(\sigma_k(S_{\theta}(x)))$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the softmax function and $\sigma_k(\cdot)$ denotes the k^{th} element. The distillation loss, illustrated in Figure 2, is given by a weighted combination of Kullback-Leibler divergences between the j^{th} teacher’s softmaxed output and corresponding student-teacher’s softmaxed feature map:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}(S_{\theta}^{(T)}, T, x) = \sum_{j=1}^J w_j \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}(S_{\theta}^{(T_j)}, T_j, x)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}(S_{\theta}^{(T_j)}, T_j, x) = \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_k(S_{\theta}^{(T_j)}(x)) \log \frac{\sigma_k(S_{\theta}^{(T_j)}(x))}{\sigma_k(T_j(x))}.$$

The normalization weights allow teachers to contribute to the distillation loss inversely proportional to their cross-entropy loss and are defined by:

$$w_j = \frac{\exp(-\mathcal{L}_C(T_j, x, y))}{\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(-\mathcal{L}_C(T_j, x, y))}.$$




Figure 2: **Distilling knowledge from teacher logits to student-teacher feature map**. An example (x) passed to the student (S_{θ}) and three teachers (T_1 , T_2 , and T_3) models.

3.1 Teacher Heterogeneity

Adversarial examples that are generated with respect to one model are often misclassified by another model with similar architectures [Mahmood *et al.*, 2021]. This phenomena is referred to as transferability [Liu *et al.*, 2016]. However, adversarial examples generated for a specific model architecture are not often misclassified by models with markedly different architectures [Mahmood *et al.*, 2021]. For example, the adversarial examples generated by vision transformers (ViT) [Dosovitskiy *et al.*, 2021] are not often misclassified by ResNets. In the context of adversarial distillation, achieving robustness has focused primarily on CNNs [Zhao *et al.*, 2022; Zi *et al.*, 2021; Zhu *et al.*, 2022; Goldblum *et al.*, 2020]. To the best of our knowledge, it remains an open question on how the low transferability phenomena occurring between CNNs and ViTs can be leveraged to achieve robustness in a knowledge distillation framework. DARHT specifically ad-

dresses this question by employing heterogeneous teachers (i.e., CNN and ViTs) to achieve greater robustness than a homogeneous teacher setup. We include ViTs in the context of distilling adversarial robustness from multiple teachers, specifically to investigate whether multiple teachers with heterogeneous architectures provide complementary robustness to the student; that is, do the different learned features and decision boundaries of two significantly different architectures provide increased robustness compared to their homogeneous counterparts in a distillation setting. Given that adversarial training algorithms do perturb adversarial subspaces [Tramèr *et al.*, 2017], DARHT also considers heterogeneity with respect to adversarial training algorithms.

3.2 Monte Carlo Dropout in DARHT

The student model also implements Monte Carlo dropout, which is typically applied during neural network training to increase generalization performance [Srivastava *et al.*, 2014] or to model uncertainty [Gal and Ghahramani, 2016]. Defense dropout algorithms use dropout during training and testing and have been shown to increase model robustness against adversarial attacks in a way that is complementary to distillation as defense [Wang *et al.*, 2018]. We implement Monte Carlo dropout on the feature map before the student-teacher feature map. By conducting several forward passes on a given example, the model generates a variety of predictions, which are subsequently averaged before the softmax operation.

3.3 DARHT Training

DARHT optimizes the Equation 1 with respect to student parameters θ using Algorithm 1. Mini-batches are created by repeatedly sampling a clean example and generating an adversarial example with probability 0.5 using an adversarial training algorithm and the student model.

Algorithm 1 DARHT Training

Input: clean examples x_{cln} and labels y

Parameters: Student model S_θ , pretrained teacher models $\{T_j\}_{j=1}^J$, adversarial algorithm $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$, training iterations I , Monte Carlo (MC) iterations C

Output: adversarially trained S_θ

```

1: for epochs  $i = 1$  to  $I$  do
2:    $x_{adv}, y \leftarrow \mathcal{F}(\theta_s^{(i)}, x, y)$  {comp. adv. example}
3:    $x \leftarrow \{x_{adv}, x_{cln}\}$  {randomly pick example}
4:   Initialize empty arrays  $U, V$ 
5:   for MC iterations  $c = 1$  to  $C$  do
6:     Store  $S_{\theta^{(i)}}(x)$  in  $U$ ,  $S_{\theta^{(i)}}^{(T)}(x)$  in  $V$ 
7:   end for
8:    $\bar{S}_{\theta^{(i)}}(x), \bar{S}_{\theta^{(i)}}^{(T)}(x) \leftarrow \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C U_c, \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C V_c$ 
9:    $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_C(\bar{S}_{\theta^{(i)}}, x, y) + \mathcal{L}_K(\bar{S}_{\theta^{(i)}}^{(T)}, T, x)$ 
10:   $\theta_{i+1} \leftarrow \theta_i - \eta \nabla_{\theta_i} \cdot \mathcal{L}$ 
11: end for

```

4 Results

Model and Datasets. We performed extensive evaluations of DARHT with respect to both adversarial distillation methods and adversarial training algorithms on the

CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 [Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2009] and Tiny ImageNet [Le and Yang, 2015] datasets. For comparison we employed two state-of-the-art adversarial distillation approaches, RSLAD [Zi *et al.*, 2021] and MTARD [Zhao *et al.*, 2022]. RSLAD and MTARD are trained with a student ResNet-18 [He *et al.*, 2015] model. We also compared DARHT with four different adversarial training algorithms, Madry [Madry *et al.*, 2018], curriculum adversarial training (CAT) [Cai *et al.*, 2018], dynamic adversarial training (DAT) [Wang *et al.*, 2019a], friendly adversarial training (FAT) [Zhang *et al.*, 2020]. Madry, CAT, DAT and FAT are trained with a student WideResNet-32 and WideResNet-34 [Zagoruyko and Komodakis, 2016].

Training and Evaluation. For the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets, we trained student models using a stochastic gradient descent (SGD) optimizer and 100 epochs with an initial learning rate, momentum, and weight decay set to 0.1, 0.9, and $2e-4$, respectively. For Tiny ImageNet, we used a linear learning rate warmup to reach a learning rate 0.1 at the 20th epoch and then a learning rate decay scheduled at epochs 60 and 80. We evaluated the adversarial robustness of defense strategies with respect to clean examples and adversarial examples generated from white-box attacks, including the fast gradient sign method (FGSM) [Goodfellow *et al.*, 2015], projected gradient descent (PGD) [Madry *et al.*, 2018], Carlini and Wagner using an L_∞ distance metric (CW_∞) [Carlini and Wagner, 2017], and Auto-PGD [Croce and Hein, 2020], and the black-box Square Attack [Andriushchenko *et al.*, 2020]. We used a 10-step PGD with random start size 0.001 and step size $2/255$. The maximum perturbation was bounded to the L_∞ norm $\epsilon = 8/255$ for all attacks.

Adversarial examples used in training were generated following FAT [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] and the tradeoff-inspired adversarial defense via surrogate-loss minimization (TRADES) method [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] original settings; in direct comparisons with other adversarial distillation approaches, we used the same adversarial models. We evaluated adversarial distillation approaches using the weighted robust accuracy (W-Robust), which is the average of the robust and clean accuracies [Zhao *et al.*, 2022]. Our appendix provides detailed information about the heterogeneous teacher models we used, including ResNet-164s, vision transformers (ViTs), and WideResNets (WRNs).

4.1 Evaluating Heterogeneous Teachers

First, we evaluated whether training with architecturally diverse teachers (low transferability configuration) provides some benefit with respect to robustness compared to architecturally similar teachers (high transferability). We created three DARHT configurations that vary based on their teacher architecture configuration and performance on CIFAR-100 (Table 1). We tested the training accuracy and weighted robustness on CIFAR-100 for each DARHT configuration (Figure 3). The Hetero-Mix DARHT (heterogeneous teachers) had consistently better weighted robustness than the homogeneous DARHT configurations for each attack. Interestingly, although the Homo-ResNet configuration had the highest training accuracy, its weighted robustness was only marginally better than the worst performing configuration




Figure 3: The performance of the student (ResNet-18) on training accuracy and W-Robust metrics under FGSM, PGD, and CW_∞ attacks is evaluated with three distinct groups of teachers: Homo-ResNet, Hetero-Mix, and Homo-ViT on the CIFAR-100 dataset.

that only used natural teachers (Homo-ViT). This may be due to the high adversarial transferability between the teacher (ResNet-164) and student architectures (ResNet-18) [Yu *et al.*, 2023], or the exceedingly high accuracy of the teachers leading to overfitting in the student, which is suggested by the increasing training accuracy with simultaneously stable weighted robustness. Overall, these results suggest that heterogeneous teacher architectures do provide increased robustness compared to homogeneous teachers (i.e., provide complementary robustness).

Configurations	Models	Accuracy
Homo-ResNet	AT-ResNet-164 ₁	99.79%
	AT-ResNet-164 ₂	99.47%
Hetero-Mix	AT-WRN-70	88.56%
	AT-ViT-B-16	75.56%
Homo-ViT	NAT-ViT-B-16	60.10%
	NAT-ViT-B-32	71.92%

Table 1: Teacher’s details for Homo-ResNet, Hetero-Mix and Homo-ViT groups. This categorization of the groups was done based on the accuracy and architecture of the teachers on the student training data (CIFAR-100).

Additional teachers. Next, we evaluated the clean and robust accuracies of DARHT with respect to the FGSM, Auto-PGD (APGD), and CW_∞ attacks as a function of the cardinality and composition of the teacher set on CIFAR-100. We included four DARHT configurations with different adversarially trained teacher compositions: (1) two WRN-70, (2) two ViT-B-32, (3) one WRN-70 and one ViT-B-32, and (4) two WRN-70 and two ViT-B-32. Teacher models were trained using FAT with $\tau = 1$; for compositions that had two of the same model architecture, the second model was adversarially trained with $\tau = 2$. Based on our prior observations of under- and overfitting (Figure 3), we selected teachers with accuracies between 75% and 90% on the training data. We again observed that DARHT configurations with heterogeneous teachers outperformed configurations with homogeneous teachers (Table 2). Moreover, the configuration with four teachers outperformed other DARHT configurations, exhibiting improvements of up to 2.5% in clean accuracy and up to 6.1% in adversarial robustness to APGD when compared to the second highest performing DARHT configuration. Ad-

ditionally, the accuracies for clean examples and adversarial attacks were relatively stable over epochs (Figure 4).

Configurations	Clean	FGSM	PGD	APGD	CW_∞
2 WRN	63.6%	32.9%	21.8%	20.1%	22.4%
2 ViT	63.8%	36.1%	22.6%	21.0%	23.0%
WRN + ViT	65.4%	35.1%	23.7%	22.9%	23.3%
2 WRN + 2 ViT	67.1%	38.6%	25.9%	24.3%	24.5%

Table 2: DARHT accuracy with a ResNet-18 student on CIFAR-100 as a function of teacher composition. WRN and ViT denote WRN-70 and ViT-B-32 architectures, respectively.




Figure 4: APGD Robustness and clean accuracies for the DARHT student (ResNet-18) and different teacher compositions across epochs on CIFAR-100.

Transferability experiments. We next evaluated whether heterogeneous teachers provide an explicit advantage by reducing transferability of adversarial examples from the student to the teachers. In total, we evaluated three DARHT configurations: (1) two ResNet-164, (2) one WRN-70 and one ViT-B-16, and (3) two ViT-B-16. We randomly selected 1000 examples from CIFAR-100 that all teachers classified correctly and generated adversarial examples using their respective DARHT student models (ResNet-18). Then, we evaluated transferability by computing the number of adversarial examples that fooled the student and the teacher normalized by the number of examples fooling the student (i.e., examples that transferred to the teacher). Transferability for the homogeneous DARHT configurations (1) and (3) were 46.48% and 49.81%, respectively; only 39.58% of adversarial examples transferred in the heterogeneous DARHT con-

figuration. In the same heterogeneous model, we also noticed that 27.05% of examples that the ViT-B-16 model misclassified were correctly classified by the student; this is considerably higher than the next highest model (7.91% in configuration 3). One possible explanation for this is that training with the WRN-70 model helps the student recover from the (erroneous) learned knowledge of the ViT-B-16 model by exploiting the low transferability between these architectures. In total, these experiments suggest that leveraging a more diverse set of teachers decreases adversarial transferability from students to teachers and, combined with a student that explicitly represents teacher logits, increases adversarial robustness.

4.2 Comparing Adversarial Distillation Methods

Having established that DARHT with heterogeneous teachers is preferred, we evaluated a heterogeneous DARHT configuration against two state-of-the-art adversarial distillation approaches, MTARD and RSLAD, on CIFAR-100. Since MTARD uses two teacher models, we selected a two-teacher configuration for DARHT, which included the same WRN-70 adversarial teacher used in MTARD and RSLAD (trained with TRADES) and a ViT-B-16 (trained with FAT). The student architecture was a ResNet-18 for all methods. We evaluated performance based on clean accuracy, robust accuracy and W-Robust with respect to white-box attacks FGSM, PGD, CW_∞ , and APGD, and the black-box Square Attack.

DARHT achieved the highest clean and W-Robust accuracies across all adversarial attack methods. In particular, DARHT performed 9.6% and 8.0% better than RSLAD and MTARD, respectively, in terms of W-Robust and with respect to the CW_∞ attack (Table 3). While RSLAD achieved the best robust accuracies across most adversarial attacks, the clean accuracy was substantially lower than MTARD and DARHT. With respect to the black-box Square Attack, DARHT achieved 10.8% and 4.76% improvement in W-Robust compared to RSLAD and MTARD, respectively. Next, we executed the APGD and Square attacks on each model using 30 trials each with 1,000 adversarially generated examples. DARHT achieved significantly higher W-Robust than RSLAD for both SA and APGD (Mann-Whitney U test, $p \leq 1.66 \times 10^{-11}$ and $p \leq 2.66 \times 10^{-3}$, respectively); similar results were observed with respect to MTARD (Mann-Whitney U test, $p \leq 5.08 \times 10^{-8}$ and $p \leq 2.70 \times 10^{-4}$, respectively). DARHT’s increased performance was evidenced by the W-Robust distributions of DARHT being shifted to the right when compared to RSLAD and MTARD (Figure 5). Results generated for CIFAR-10 were largely consistent with these evaluations (see Appendix).




Figure 5: W-Robust distributions with respect to the APGD and Square attacks for MTARD, RSLAD and DARHT.

Attack	Defense	CIFAR-100		
		Clean	Robust	W-Robust
FGSM	RSLAD	58.25%	34.73%	46.49%
	MTARD	64.30%	31.49%	47.90%
	DARHT	66.98%	40.10%	53.54%
PGD	RSLAD	58.25%	31.19%	44.72%
	MTARD	64.30%	24.95%	44.63%
	DARHT	66.98%	27.90%	47.44%
CW_∞	RSLAD	58.25%	28.21%	43.23%
	MTARD	64.30%	23.42%	43.86%
	DARHT	66.98%	27.80%	47.39%
APGD*	RSLAD	57.91%	30.52%	44.22%
	MTARD	64.27%	24.06%	44.17%
	DARHT	66.98%	24.70%	45.84%
SA*	RSLAD	57.91%	29.48%	43.70%
	MTARD	64.27%	28.25%	46.26%
	DARHT	66.98%	29.94%	48.46%

Table 3: Adversarial distillation method performance on CIFAR-100. The results of MTARD and RSLAD are reported from [Zhao *et al.*, 2022] and [Zi *et al.*, 2021] for FGSM, PGD, and CW_∞ attacks. The * symbol denotes that the results for APGD and SA are reproduced using officially released models.

Attack	Defense	Tiny ImageNet		
		Clean	Robust	W-Robust
CW_∞	RSLAD	36.80%	14.80%	25.80%
	MTARD	40.90%	12.24%	26.57%
	LAS-AT	44.86%	18.45%	31.66%
	DARHT	48.20%	17.32%	32.76%
APGD	RSLAD	36.80%	16.70%	26.75%
	MTARD	40.90%	13.70%	27.30%
	LAS-AT	44.86%	21.96%	33.41%
	DARHT	48.20%	20.45%	34.33%
SA	RSLAD	36.80%	15.60%	26.20%
	MTARD	40.90%	13.60%	27.25%
	LAS-AT	44.86%	19.80%	32.33%
	DARHT	48.20%	18.74%	33.47%

Table 4: Clean and robust accuracies for adversarial distillation methods and LAS-AT under CW_∞ , APGD, and Square attacks on the Tiny ImageNet dataset.

We also assessed adversarial distillation methods on Tiny ImageNet. Given the lack of an official implementation of MTARD and RSLAD, we reproduced MTARD and RSLAD using the same hyperparameter settings employed in DARHT; further implementation considerations are discussed in the appendix. DARHT consistently outperformed RSLAD and MTARD in terms of clean accuracy, robustness, and W-Robust across all metrics (Table 4). Even when compared to the state-of-the-art *learnable attack strategy* adversarial training method (LAS-AT) [Jia *et al.*, 2022], DARHT achieved a higher clean accuracy and 2.7% and 3.5% gains in W-Robust for the APGD and Square attacks, respectively.

4.3 Comparing Adversarial Training Algorithms

We evaluated the efficacy of our adversarial distillation approach against four adversarial training algorithms on CIFAR-10 (Table. 5). We kept the same settings as prior work for both models, WRN-32 and WRN-34 [Zhang *et al.*, 2020]; DARHT included a ViT-B-16 and WRN-34 teacher (both FAT trained). Since adversarially distillation techniques can benefit from early stopping [Maroto *et al.*, 2022], we terminated adversarial training after 65 epochs, which is approximately half the number of epochs (120) typically used for FAT. Compared to other adversarial training methods, DARHT-WRN-32 achieved the best clean and robust accuracies against all attacks. With respect to FAT, which was used to adversarially train DARHT teachers, DARHT-WRN-32 achieved notable improvements of 9.69% for PGD and 10.42% for CW_∞ . Similar results were observed when comparing DARHT with FAT in WRN-34 models. These results highlight how (a) multiple teachers in an adversarial distillation framework can improve clean and robust accuracies compared to single-model adversarial training methods.

Defense	Attack (%)			
	Clean	FGSM	PGD	CW_∞
Madry-WRN-32*	87.3	56.1	45.8	46.8
CAT-WRN-32*	77.4	57.1	46.1	42.3
DAT-WRN-32*	85.0	63.5	48.7	47.3
FAT-WRN-32†	89.3	65.5	46.1	46.8
DARHT-WRN-32	91.9	70.8	50.6	51.7
FAT-WRN-34†	89.9	61.0	49.7	49.4
DARHT-WRN-34	91.7	69.4	50.2	51.7

Table 5: **White-box attacks on DARHT and adversarially trained WRN for CIFAR-10.** The * and † symbols denote results reported from Wang *et al.* [2019b] and Zhang *et al.* [2020], respectively.

4.4 Evaluating Heterogeneous Training Methods

Finally, we evaluated the impact of teachers trained with different adversarial training algorithms (FAT and TRADES) on student robustness. We compared DARHT configurations with WRN-34 and a ViT-B teachers; the homogeneous DARHT teachers were trained using FAT and the heterogeneous DARHT teachers were trained using both FAT and

Teacher Groups	Clean	FGSM	PGD	CW_∞
Heterogeneous	91.9%	70.8%	50.6%	51.7%
Homogeneous	91.6%	68.8%	49.9%	50.3%

Table 6: **Accuracies of students in homogeneous and heterogeneous adversarial training methods for teachers on CIFAR-10.** The homogeneous teacher configuration includes a FAT trained ViT and a FAT trained WRN. The heterogeneous teacher configuration includes a TRADES trained WRN and a FAT trained ViT.

TRADES. The heterogeneous DARHT configuration exhibited marginally improved robust and clean accuracies compared to the homogeneous DARHT (Table 6). We observed that the heterogeneous model consistently maintained higher clean accuracy and robustness averaged over attacks (FGSM, PGD and CW_∞) than the homogeneous model for epochs 61 through 70 (Fig. 6). However, we note that the increase in performance is relatively small when compared to heterogeneous architectures.




Figure 6: **DARHT performance across epochs for heterogeneous adversarial training methods.** Average robustness (left) and clean accuracy (right) were tracked across epochs 60 to 70 for DARHT configurations with teachers trained using the same (FAT, red) or different (TRADES and FAT, blue) adversarial training methods.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced DARHT, a framework for combining the complementary strengths of heterogeneous teachers with low adversarial example transferability into a single student model. Results on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Tiny ImageNet demonstrated improvements in adversarial robustness and clean accuracy with respect to recently developed adversarial training algorithms and both single and multiple teacher adversarial distillation methods. We demonstrated that DARHT effectively leverages heterogeneous teacher (both with respect to architecture and adversarial training algorithms) to provide increased robustness compared to the homogeneous teacher setting (a phenomenon we labeled complementary robustness). In summary, using multiple teacher models that differ with respect to architecture (and, to a degree, adversarial training algorithms) is an effective strategy to increase both the robustness and clean accuracy of a student model in adversarial distillation settings.

References

- Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, Nicolas Flammarion, and Matthias Hein. Square attack: a query-efficient black-box adversarial attack via random search. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 484–501. Springer, 2020.
- Tao Bai, Jinnan Chen, Jun Zhao, Bihan Wen, Xudong Jiang, and Alex Kot. Feature distillation with guided adversarial contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09922*, 2020.
- Tao Bai, Jinqi Luo, Jun Zhao, Bihan Wen, and Qian Wang. Recent advances in adversarial training for adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01356*, 2021.
- Qi-Zhi Cai, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. Curriculum adversarial training. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3740–3747, 2018.
- Yulong Cao, Chaowei Xiao, Benjamin Cyr, Yimeng Zhou, Won Park, Sara Rampazzi, Qi Alfred Chen, Kevin Fu, and Z Morley Mao. Adversarial sensor attack on lidar-based perception in autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 2267–2281, 2019.
- Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 39–57. IEEE, 2017.
- Tianlong Chen, Zhenyu Zhang, Sijia Liu, Shiyu Chang, and Zhangyang Wang. Robust overfitting may be mitigated by properly learned smoothing. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Francesco Croce and Matthias Hein. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2206–2216. PMLR, 2020.
- Nilesh Dalvi, Pedro Domingos, Mausam, Sumit Sanghai, and Deepak Verma. Adversarial classification. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 99–108, 2004.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *ICLR*, 2021.
- Samuel G Finlayson, John D Bowers, Joichi Ito, Jonathan L Zittrain, Andrew L Beam, and Isaac S Kohane. Adversarial attacks on medical machine learning. *Science*, 363(6433):1287–1289, 2019.
- Tommaso Furlanello, Zachary Lipton, Michael Tschannen, Laurent Itti, and Anima Anandkumar. Born again neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1607–1616. PMLR, 2018.
- Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1050–1059. PMLR, 2016.
- Micah Goldblum, Liam Fowl, Soheil Feizi, and Tom Goldstein. Adversarially robust distillation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 3996–4003, 2020.
- Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- Kaiming He, X. Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2015.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- Xiaojun Jia, Yong Zhang, Baoyuan Wu, Ke Ma, Jue Wang, and Xiaochun Cao. Las-at: Adversarial training with learnable attack strategy. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 13388–13398, 2022.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- Ya Le and Xuan S. Yang. Tiny imagenet visual recognition challenge. 2015.
- Yanpei Liu, Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. Delving into transferable adversarial examples and black-box attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02770*, 2016.
- Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Kaleel Mahmood, Rigel Mahmood, and Marten van Dijk. On the robustness of vision transformers to adversarial examples. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 7818–7827, 2021.
- Kaleel Mahmood, Phuong Ha Nguyen, Lam M. Nguyen, Thanh Nguyen, and Marten Van Dijk. Besting the black-box: Barrier zones for adversarial example defense. *IEEE Access*, 10:1451–1474, 2022.
- Javier Maroto, Guillermo Ortiz-Jiménez, and Pascal Frossard. On the benefits of knowledge distillation for adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07159*, 2022.
- Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Xi Wu, Somesh Jha, and Ananthram Swami. Distillation as a defense to adversarial perturbations against deep neural networks. In *2016 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 582–597. IEEE, 2016.
- Mary Phuong and Christoph Lampert. Towards understanding knowledge distillation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5142–5151. PMLR, 2019.

- Edward Raff, Jared Sylvester, Steven Forsyth, and Mark McLean. Barrage of random transforms for adversarially robust defense. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6521–6530, 2019.
- Aditi Raghunathan, Jacob Steinhardt, and Percy Liang. Certified defenses against adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09344*, 2018.
- Leslie Rice, Eric Wong, and Zico Kolter. Overfitting in adversarially robust deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8093–8104. PMLR, 2020.
- Landan Seguin, Anthony Ndirango, Neeli Mishra, SueYeon Chung, and Tyler Lee. Understanding the logit distributions of adversarially-trained deep neural networks, 2021.
- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The journal of machine learning research*, 15(1):1929–1958, 2014.
- Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- Jiayi Tang, Rakesh Shivanna, Zhe Zhao, Dong Lin, Anima Singh, Ed H Chi, and Sagar Jain. Understanding and improving knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03532*, 2020.
- Florian Tramèr, Nicolas Papernot, Ian Goodfellow, Dan Boneh, and Patrick McDaniel. The space of transferable adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.03453*, 2017.
- Florian Tramer, Nicholas Carlini, Wieland Brendel, and Aleksander Madry. On adaptive attacks to adversarial example defenses. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1633–1645, 2020.
- Siyue Wang, Xiao Wang, Pu Zhao, Wujie Wen, David Kaeli, Peter Chin, and Xue Lin. Defensive dropout for hardening deep neural networks under adversarial attacks. In *2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2018.
- Yisen Wang, Xingjun Ma, James Bailey, Jinfeng Yi, Bowen Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. On the convergence and robustness of adversarial training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6586–6595. PMLR, 2019.
- Yisen Wang, Xingjun Ma, James Bailey, Jinfeng Yi, Bowen Zhou, and Quanquan Gu. On the convergence and robustness of adversarial training. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6586–6595. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019.
- Nuo Xu, Kaleel Mahmood, Haowen Fang, Ethan Rathbun, Caiwen Ding, and Wujie Wen. Securing the spike: On the transferability and security of spiking neural networks to adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.03358*, 2022.
- Wenqian Yu, Jindong Gu, Zhijiang Li, and Philip Torr. Reliable evaluation of adversarial transferability, 2023.
- Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. Wide residual networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1605.07146, 2016.
- Hongyang Zhang, Yaodong Yu, Jiantao Jiao, Eric Xing, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Michael Jordan. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 7472–7482. PMLR, 2019.
- Jingfeng Zhang, Xilie Xu, Bo Han, Gang Niu, Lizhen Cui, Masashi Sugiyama, and Mohan Kankanhalli. Attacks which do not kill training make adversarial learning stronger. In *ICML*, 2020.
- Shiji Zhao, Jie Yu, Zhenlong Sun, Bo Zhang, and Xingxing Wei. Enhanced accuracy and robustness via multi-teacher adversarial distillation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 585–602. Springer, 2022.
- Shiji Zhao, Xizhe Wang, and Xingxing Wei. Mitigating the accuracy-robustness trade-off via multi-teacher adversarial distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16170*, 2023.
- Jianing Zhu, Jiangchao Yao, Bo Han, Jingfeng Zhang, Tongliang Liu, Gang Niu, Jingren Zhou, Jianliang Xu, and Hongxia Yang. Reliable adversarial distillation with unreliable teachers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Bojia Zi, Shihao Zhao, Xingjun Ma, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Revisiting adversarial robustness distillation: Robust soft labels make student better. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 16443–16452, 2021.