

# Distributional Adversarial Loss\*

Saba Ahmadi, Siddharth Bhandari, Avrim Blum, Chen Dan, and Prabhav Jain

Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago

{saba, siddharth, avrim, chendan, prabhavjain}@ttic.edu

June 6, 2024

## Abstract

A major challenge in defending against adversarial attacks is the enormous space of possible attacks that even a simple adversary might perform. To address this, prior work has proposed a variety of defenses that effectively reduce the size of this space. These include randomized smoothing methods that add noise to the input to take away some of the adversary’s impact. Another approach is input discretization which limits the adversary’s possible number of actions.

Motivated by these two approaches, we introduce a new notion of adversarial loss which we call *distributional adversarial loss*, to unify these two forms of effectively weakening an adversary. In this notion, we assume for each original example, the allowed adversarial perturbation set is a family of distributions (e.g., induced by a smoothing procedure), and the adversarial loss over each example is the maximum loss over all the associated distributions. The goal is to minimize the overall adversarial loss. Two scenarios where it is desirable to optimize the above loss are: first, when for each original example  $x$ , any adversarial perturbation distribution is covered by some distribution in the distribution set associated with the original example  $x$ . Therefore, instead of considering an *unbounded number of perturbations*, it is sufficient to only consider a *bounded number of distributions*. Second, in the case of randomized smoothing methods, we show that if the distributional adversarial loss on clean images is low then it is also low on perturbed images.

We show generalization guarantees for our notion of adversarial loss in terms of the VC-dimension of the hypothesis class and the size of the set of allowed adversarial distributions associated with each input. We also investigate the role of randomness in achieving robustness against adversarial attacks in the methods described above. We show a general derandomization technique that preserves the extent of a randomized classifier’s robustness against adversarial attacks. We corroborate the procedure experimentally via derandomizing the Random Projection Filters framework of Dong and Xu [2023]. Our procedure also improves the robustness of the model against various adversarial attacks.

## 1 Introduction and Related Work

Recent research extensively explores the development of robust predictors against adversarial perturbations, revealing the susceptibility of deep neural networks to imperceptible adversarial noise Biggio et al. [2013], Szegedy et al. [2013], Goodfellow et al. [2015]. Adversarial perturbations involve introducing limited noise  $\delta$  to an image  $x$  (or more generally,  $x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)$  for a perturbation set  $\mathcal{A}(x)$ ), resulting in visually indistinguishable yet misclassified instances. This phenomenon poses significant threats to real-world applications such as self-driving cars Cao et al. [2021] and healthcare Finlayson et al. [2019].

---

\*Authors are ordered alphabetically.

To bolster classifier resilience against these perturbations, various *empirical* defenses have been proposed, with adversarial training [Goodfellow et al., 2015, Madry et al., 2018b, Kurakin et al., 2016] being a prominent approach. However, these methods often overfit and still exhibit vulnerability to meticulously crafted adversaries on test points [Carlini and Wagner, 2017, Athalye and Carlini, 2018]. Subsequently, techniques for *certifiable robustness* have been introduced. These methods ensure that for any given input  $x$ , whether it is clean or perturbed, a radius  $\rho$  can be determined such that all inputs  $x'$  within the distance  $\rho$  from the original input  $x$  are guaranteed to receive the same label as  $x$  [Wong and Kolter, 2018, Gowal et al., 2018, Raghunathan et al., 2018, Tjeng et al., 2019].

*Randomized smoothing* methods Cohen et al. [2019], Salman et al. [2019], Zhai et al. [2020], Mohapatra et al. [2020] have been proposed as certifiable robustness techniques that scale to large-scale datasets such as ImageNet. In randomized smoothing, given a possibly perturbed input, the final classification is provided by taking the majority vote over the Gaussian-smoothed perturbations of the input, or other suitable smoothing perturbations. The principle here is that the added noise helps to drown out the adversarial perturbation present in the input: this effectively *weakens the adversary*.

Another approach for weakening the adversary is by limiting their possible number of perturbations, i.e.  $\mathcal{A}(x)$ . An example of this approach is the family of pixel discretization methods that work by first constructing a codebook of codewords for pixel values, and then discretizing the input using these codewords, hoping to remove the adversarial effect by this rounding procedure [Chen et al., 2019]. In a relevant work, Montasser et al. [2019] show a lower bound construction, where when making no assumptions on  $\mathcal{A}(x)$ , a hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  with finite VC-dimension is not robustly PAC-learnable with any proper learning rule that outputs predictors in  $\mathcal{H}$ . This highlights the importance of *reducing* the effective number of adversary’s possible actions using methods such as input discretization.

Motivated by these two ideas of adding noise to the input and limiting the adversary’s actions, we propose a notion of adversarial loss which we call *distributional adversarial loss*. Here, for each example  $x$ , the perturbation set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is a family of distributions, where a perturbation  $x'$  of  $x$  can be sampled from any of the distributions  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  corresponds roughly to the set of distributions that arise when the adversary chooses a perturbed version of  $x$ , say  $x'$ , and  $x'$  is smoothed by adding noise or by applying a rounding procedure to it. Given that, the distributional adversarial loss is defined as  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)\sim\mathcal{D}} [\max_{u\in\mathcal{U}(x)} [\mathbb{E}_{z\sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y]]]$ . That is, for each non-adversarial example sampled from an underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , the adversarial loss on  $(x, y)$  is defined as the maximum expected loss over all the distributions in its perturbation set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . The population loss is the expected adversarial loss over all the samples coming from the underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ .

We expand on two important and desirable properties of optimizing our notion of distributional adversarial loss. First, suppose that for each input  $x$ , any adversarial choice  $x'$  is covered by some distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ <sup>1</sup>. Therefore, by having a low distributional adversarial loss on  $u$ , the classifier would also have a good performance on  $x'$ . As a result, instead of considering an *unbounded* number of adversary’s actions, it suffices to consider a *bounded* number of distributions that cover the adversary’s actions. Second, in randomized smoothing methods, the perturbed input  $x'$  is being smoothed by adding some Gaussian noise (or other suitable noise) to it. Suppose for each original example  $x$ , its distribution set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  consists of only the Gaussian around  $x$ . When  $\|x - x'\|$  is bounded, the Gaussian distribution around  $x'$  is close to the Gaussian around  $x$  in the total variation distance. As a result, by having a low distributional adversarial loss on the Gaussian-smoothed  $x$  the classifier will also have a low distributional adversarial loss on the Gaussian-smoothed  $x'$ . For more details see Section 2.4.2.

In light of the above discussions, we study the *PAC-learnability* of distributional adversarial loss. We show that if enough examples are sampled from the underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , and for each sampled example

---

<sup>1</sup>By covering, we mean that  $u$  is close in some notion of distance, e.g. total variation distance, to a distribution supported on a ball around  $x'$ . The radius of the ball depends on the adversary’s power. More details in Section 2.4.2.

$(x, y)$  enough perturbations are sampled from each of their distributions  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , then the estimation error, i.e. the gap between the empirical distributional adversarial loss and population distributional adversarial loss, would be small.

*Derandomization:* Another natural point of inquiry about the robust classifiers (certifiable or not) built using the above approaches is whether they can be made deterministic, i.e., no randomness is required during inference time. This question has been answered in the affirmative in some cases by Levine and Feizi [2021]. There are a few advantages to having a deterministic classifier. In pivotal decisions, we aim for the classifier’s output to be deterministic, ensuring consistent labeling for a given input (likewise for the certification radius). Additionally, derandomization has the potential to enhance the classifier’s robustness against adversarial attacks (see Section 3 for more discussion). In this work we show a generic procedure to derandomize any robust classifier, which preserves the extent of its robustness and certification.

## Our Contributions

- We show that bounded VC-dimension is sufficient for distributionally adversarial PAC-learning with a proper learning rule. [Section 2, Theorems 2.1 and 2.3]
- Our result for distributionally adversarial PAC-learning can also be applied to certifiable robustness methods including randomized smoothing. [Section 2.4.2]
- We unify two different ways of effectively weakening an adversary, adding noise to the input and input discretization, using our notion of distributional adversarial loss.
- We show a general derandomization technique that preserves the extent of a randomized classifier’s robustness and certification. Additionally, our experimental findings suggest that this approach has the potential to enhance the robust accuracy of the initial classifier.

All the missing proofs are in the Appendix.

## 2 Distributional Adversarial Loss

### 2.1 Problem Setup

**Loss Function** We are given an instance space  $\mathcal{X}$  and label space  $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, +1\}$  and a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . For each input  $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$ , i.e., input  $x$  with label  $y$ , the perturbation set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is a family of distributions, where a perturbation  $z$  of  $(x, y)$  is sampled from an adversarially chosen distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Given that, the distributional adversarial loss of a classifier  $h$  is defined as

$$\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right]$$

That is, for each non-adversarial example sampled from an underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , the robust loss on  $(x, y)$  is defined as the maximum expected loss over all the distributions in its perturbation set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . The objective is to minimize the expected robust loss over all the samples coming from the underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . First, we consider a setting where for each example  $(x, y)$ , the size of the perturbation set is bounded, i.e.  $|\mathcal{U}(x)| \leq k$  for some value  $k > 0$ . Next, we consider two further extensions: First, in Section 2.4, we study a setting where  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  can be unbounded, however, there exists a set of representative distributions  $\mathcal{R}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(x)$  where  $|\mathcal{R}(x)| \leq k$  and for each distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x) \setminus \mathcal{R}(x)$ , there exists a representative distribution  $r \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  where the total variation distance between  $u$  and  $r$  is bounded. Furthermore, in Section 2.4.3, we consider a scenario where the number of distribution perturbations is unbounded, however, there exists a set

of *representative* distributions of size at most  $k$  such that each distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , is completely covered by  $\mathcal{R}(x)$ , i.e. the probability density function of  $u$  is point-wise bounded by the maximum of probability density functions of the distributions in  $\mathcal{R}(x)$ .

**PAC Learning of Distributional Adversarial Loss:** We study the *sample complexity* for *PAC-learning of distributional adversarial loss* in the realizable and agnostic settings. Given a hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$ , our goal is to find a learning rule  $\mathcal{L}$  such that for any distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  finds a classifier  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  that competes with the predictor  $h^* \in \mathcal{H}$  where  $h^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \operatorname{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h)$ , using a number of samples that is independent of the underlying distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . In the following, we formally define the notion of distributionally adversarial PAC learning in realizable and agnostic settings.

**Definition 2.1** (Agnostic Distributionally Adversarial PAC learning). *A hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  is agnostic distributionally adversarial PAC-learnable if there exists functions  $n_{\mathcal{H}} : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow N$  and  $m : (0, 1) \rightarrow N$  and a learning algorithm  $\mathcal{L}$  with the following property: For every  $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ , and for every distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , when running the learning algorithm on a set  $S = S_c \cup S_p$  where the set of clean (unperturbed) examples  $S_c$  is consisting of  $n \geq n_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon, \delta)$  i.i.d. examples sampled from  $\mathcal{D}$  and for each example  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m \geq m(\varepsilon)$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  and added to the perturbations set  $S_p$ , the algorithm returns  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that, with probability of at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\operatorname{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq \min_{h^* \in \mathcal{H}} \operatorname{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h^*) + \varepsilon$$

**Definition 2.2** (Realizable Distributionally Adversarial PAC learning). *A hypothesis class  $\mathcal{H}$  is realizable distributionally adversarial PAC-learnable if there exists functions  $n_{\mathcal{H}} : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow N$  and  $m : (0, 1) \rightarrow N$  and a learning algorithm  $\mathcal{L}$  with the following property: For every  $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ , and for every distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , when running the learning algorithm on a set  $S = S_c \cup S_p$  where the set of clean (unperturbed) examples  $S_c$  is consisting of  $n \geq n_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon, \delta)$  i.i.d. examples sampled from  $\mathcal{D}$  and for each example  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m \geq m(\varepsilon)$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  and added to the perturbations set  $S_p$ , the algorithm returns  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that, with probability of at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\operatorname{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq \varepsilon$$

We show that bounded VC-dimension is sufficient for distributionally adversarial PAC-learning. Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 prove this in the realizable and agnostic case respectively.

**Learning Algorithm:** First, we draw a sample set  $S_c$  of clean (unperturbed) examples of size  $n \geq n_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon, \delta)$  i.i.d from  $\mathcal{D}$ . Then, for each example  $(x, y) \in S$ , we draw  $m \geq m(\varepsilon)$  samples i.i.d. from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  (or from each  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  when  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is unbounded) and add to the perturbations set  $S_p$  and let the training set be  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Therefore,  $|S| \leq n \cdot m \cdot k + n$ . For the training, we assume having access to an oracle **DALERM** that minimizes *empirical* distributional adversarial loss:

$$\hat{h} \in \operatorname{DALERM}_{\mathcal{H}}(S) = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \operatorname{DAL}_S(h)$$

where the empirical distributional adversarial loss is defined as follows:

$$\operatorname{DAL}_S(h) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right]$$

## 2.2 Realizable Distributionally Adversarial PAC Learning:

In this section, we focus on the setting where for each example  $(x, y)$ ,  $|\mathcal{U}(x)| \leq k$ . First, we show sample complexity bounds for realizable distributionally adversarial PAC-learning:

**Theorem 2.1** (VC-dimension sample bound in the realizable distributionally adversarial case). *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[VCdim(\mathcal{H}) \log(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]\right)$  where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \geq \varepsilon$  has  $DAL_S(h) > 0$  (equivalently, every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $DAL_S(h) = 0$  has  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) < \varepsilon$ ).*

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, first we show Lemma 2.1 holds, which states the following: Consider drawing a set  $S$  of  $n$  examples from  $\mathcal{D}$  where for each example  $(x, y) \in S$ ,  $m$  perturbations are drawn from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  and are added to  $S$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero empirical distributional adversarial error on  $S$  but true distributional adversarial error at least  $\varepsilon$ . Now draw a *fresh* test set  $S'$  of  $n$  examples from  $\mathcal{D}$  where for each example  $(x, y) \in S'$ ,  $m$  perturbations are drawn from each distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  and are added to  $S'$ . Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero empirical distributional adversarial loss on  $S$  but an empirical distributional adversarial loss at least  $\varepsilon/2$  on  $S'$ . We prove that  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

The purpose of this lemma is to show that we can argue about the error on a fresh test set instead of the true error on the underlying distribution. Later on, in Theorem 2.2, we show that for large enough training and test sets, the error values on the training and test sets are close. This implies that the training error is also close to the true error on the underlying distribution, hence it cannot be the case that  $DAL_S(h) = 0$  but  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) > \varepsilon$ , and it proves Theorem 2.1.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a concept class over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S_c$  and  $S'_c$  be sets of  $n$  clean (unperturbed) elements drawn from some distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $n = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2)$ . For each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  are added to a set  $S_p$  and finally  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Similarly,  $S'_c$  is augmented to get  $S'$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero empirical distributional adversarial error on  $S$  but true distributional adversarial error  $\geq \varepsilon$ :*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon, \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] = 0$$

Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero distributional adversarial loss on  $S$  but distributional adversarial loss  $\geq \varepsilon/2$  on  $S'$ :

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap S'_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon/2,$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] = 0$$

Then  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

Next, we prove Theorem 2.2. Proof of this theorem is similar to the original double-sampling trick by Vapnik and Chervonenkis [1971], Blumer et al. [1989] for showing sample complexity of PAC-learning.

However, here, we also need to argue about the perturbations of the clean examples in the dataset. The idea is first to use the application of Lemma 2.1 to argue about the distributional adversarial loss on the test data instead of population distributional adversarial loss. Furthermore, for large enough training and test data, when sampled from the same distribution, it cannot be the case that the training distributional adversarial loss is low but the test distributional adversarial loss is large.

**Theorem 2.2.** *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}[\log((5/2)\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k]) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) + \frac{7}{\varepsilon}]$  where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Let  $k = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \geq \varepsilon$  has  $DAL_S(h) > 0$  (equivalently, every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $DAL_S(h) = 0$  has  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) < \varepsilon$ ). Here,  $\mathcal{H}[\cdot]$  is the growth function of  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

Putting together Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.1 and applying Sauer's Lemma proves Theorem 2.1. Details are deferred to the Appendix.

### 2.3 Agnostic Distributionally Adversarial PAC Learning

In the agnostic setting, Theorem 2.3 gives the sample complexity bound for distributionally adversarial PAC-learning. The idea to prove Theorem 2.3, is similar to Theorem 2.1. First, the idea is that it suffices to argue about the distributional adversarial loss on a fresh test data instead of the population distributional adversarial loss. Furthermore, when the test and training data are coming from the same distribution, it cannot be the case that the training distributional adversarial loss is low but the test distributional adversarial loss is large. Finally, by the application of Sauer's lemma the proof is complete. Details are deferred to Appendix.

**Theorem 2.3** (VC-dimension sample bound in the agnostic case). *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}[VCdim(\mathcal{H}) \log(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})]\right)$  where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $|DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - DAL_S(h)| \leq \varepsilon$ .*

### 2.4 Extension to an arbitrary number of distributions

#### 2.4.1 Model I

Here we consider the scenario where the number of distribution perturbations is unbounded, however, there exists a set  $\mathcal{R}(x)$  of *representative* distributions of size at most  $k$  such that for each distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , there exists a distribution  $u_0 \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  such that the variation distance between  $u$  and  $u_0$  is bounded (at most  $\varepsilon'$ ). We show that using a similar learning algorithm that was used in the previous section, with the main difference that after drawing  $n \geq n_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon, \delta)$  i.i.d from  $\mathcal{D}$  and adding to the training set, for each clean example  $(x, y) \in S$ , the perturbations are drawn from the representative distribution sets  $\mathcal{R}(x)$  instead of the true distribution set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . In Theorems 2.4 and 2.5, we prove that training a predictor that minimizes the empirical distributional adversarial loss on  $S$ , will also minimize the population distributional adversarial loss with respect to the true perturbation sets  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ . We show the connection of this model to randomized smoothing methods in Section 2.4.2.

**Theorem 2.4** (VC-dimension sample bound in the robustly realizable case). *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[VCdim(\mathcal{H}) \log(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]\right)$ , where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote*

the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $DAL_S(h) = 0$  has  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) < \varepsilon + \varepsilon'$ .

**Theorem 2.5** (VC-dimension sample bound in the agnostic case). *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}[VCdim(\mathcal{H}) \log(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})]\right)$ , where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $|DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - DAL_S(h)| \leq \varepsilon' + \varepsilon$ .*

## 2.4.2 Connection to Randomized Smoothing

Randomized smoothing constructs a new smoothed classifier  $g$  from a base classifier  $f$ . Given an input  $x$ , classifier  $g$  returns the class that the base classifier  $f$  is most likely to return given  $x$  is perturbed using a Gaussian noise:

$$g(x) = \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in \mathcal{Y}} \Pr(f(x + \eta) = c)$$

where  $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ . This framework can be captured by Model I (Theorems 2.4 and 2.5) where  $k = 1$ . For each example  $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$ , the representative distribution set  $\mathcal{R}(x)$  consists of one single distribution that is a Gaussian around  $x$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2 I)$ . During the test time, each example  $x$  can be perturbed by adding a limited perturbation  $\delta$  to get  $x'$ . Given  $x'$  in the test time, the classifier  $g$  adds a Gaussian noise  $\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$  to  $x'$  and outputs  $g(x') = \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in \mathcal{Y}} \Pr(f(x' + \eta) = c)$ . Considering our model, the true perturbation set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  for a clean input  $x$  is a Gaussian around  $x$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2 I)$ , for  $\|x - x'\| \leq \delta$ . Given  $\|x - x'\| \leq \delta$ , the total variation distance between the Gaussians around  $x$  and  $x'$  is bounded and is a function of  $\delta$ , i.e.  $d(\delta)$ . Now by Theorems 2.4 and 2.5, it suffices to do training on the perturbations coming from the representative distributions in order to get guarantees with respect to the true perturbation sets:

$$\Pr \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{x': \|x' - x\| \leq \delta} \mathbb{E}_{\eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)} [h(x' + \eta) \neq y] \right] \leq d(\delta) + \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - p$$

which is equivalent to saying with high probability, the expected adversarial error over all the examples coming from  $\mathcal{D}$  is bounded.

## 2.4.3 Model II

In this section, we consider the scenario where the number of distribution perturbations is unbounded, however, there exists a set of *representative* distributions of size at most  $k$  such that each distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , is completely covered by  $\mathcal{R}(x)$ , i.e. the probability density function of  $u$  is point-wise bounded by the maximum of probability density functions of the distributions in  $\mathcal{R}(x)$ . Here, similar to Section 2.4.1, we use a similar learning algorithm, with the main difference that after drawing  $n \geq n_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon, \delta)$  i.i.d from  $\mathcal{D}$  and adding to the training set, for each clean example  $(x, y) \in S$ , the perturbations are drawn from the representative distribution set  $\mathcal{R}(x)$  instead of the true distribution set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . In Theorems 2.6 and 2.7, we prove that training a predictor that minimizes the empirical distributional adversarial loss on  $S$ , will also minimize the population distributional adversarial loss with respect to the true perturbation sets  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ .

**Theorem 2.6** (realizable case). *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}[VCdim(\mathcal{H}) \log(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]\right)$ , where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $DAL_S(h) = 0$  has  $DAL_{\mathcal{D}}(h) < k\varepsilon$ .*

**Theorem 2.7** (agnostic case). *For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size  $n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} [VCdim(\mathcal{H}) \log(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})]\right)$ , where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Given sample set  $S$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - \delta$ , for every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $|\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \leq k\varepsilon$ .*

### 3 Derandomization

The classifiers discussed above add noise to the perturbed input to achieve robustness and hence are randomized. We modeled this phenomenon as the adversary getting to pick from a set of distributions over perturbed inputs, namely  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ , instead of a single perturbed input. Below we show how such classifiers can be derandomized in a general fashion while retaining the performance of the original classifier.

We derandomize the part where the classifiers add noise to the input. Thus, we model the adversary in the traditional sense, i.e., for the clean input  $x$  the adversary picks a perturbed input  $x'$  from an allowed set of perturbations  $\mathcal{A}(x)$ . Our classifier  $h$  takes the input  $x'$  and uses randomness  $R$  sampled according to  $\mathcal{R}$  to make a prediction  $h(x', R)$ . Further, we also show how to derandomize a randomized certification procedure  $\rho(x', R)$ . The parameter  $\rho(x', R)$  guarantees that all inputs within distance  $\rho(x', R)$  from  $x'$ , receive the same label as  $x'$ . As mentioned in the introduction, there are a few advantages to such a derandomization. First, in critical decisions, we desire that the output of our classifier be deterministic so that it always labels a given input with the same label (same for the certification radius). Second, such a derandomization could potentially be useful in boosting the robust accuracy of the classifier against various adversaries (more on this is discussed below).

The procedure is simple to describe: given the randomized classifier  $h$  which on input  $x'$  makes the prediction  $h(x', R)$  (where  $R$  is the randomness sampled according to some distribution  $\mathcal{R}$ ), we pre-sample multiple copies of the randomness needed during inference, say  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t$  and define a new *deterministic* classifier  $h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}$  as  $\text{MAJ}(h(x', R_i) \mid i \in [t])$ . We show that when  $t = \Omega(\log |\mathcal{A}|)$  then with high probability over the choice of  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t$  the deterministic classifier  $h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}$  has an adversarial loss related closely to the performance of the original classifier, i.e.,  $\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h)$ . Recall that for the purposes of derandomization we are modeling the adversary in the traditional sense, i.e., for each clean input  $x$  the adversary is allowed to choose a perturbed input  $x'$  from an allowed set  $\mathcal{A}(x)$ . Hence, for a classifier  $h$  the definition of  $\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h)$  is modified accordingly as

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{1}[h(x', R) \neq y] \right] \right].$$

**Theorem 3.1** (Derandomizing a randomized robust classifier). *Suppose  $h$  is a randomized classifier which on input  $x$  uses randomness  $R \sim \mathcal{R}$  and outputs a label in  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}(x)$  be the set of perturbed versions of  $x$  from which the adversary chooses and define  $\varepsilon(x, y) := \max_{x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{1}[h(x', R) \neq y] \right]$ . Also, suppose that  $\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq \varepsilon$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\varepsilon(x, y)] \leq \varepsilon$ , for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For any  $0 < \eta < 1/2$ , let  $\varepsilon(\eta) := \Pr_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\varepsilon(x, y) \geq 1/2 - \eta]$  (notice that  $\varepsilon(\eta) \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-2\eta}$ ). Let  $\delta > 0$  be a parameter. Set  $t = \frac{100}{\eta^2} \cdot \log(|\mathcal{A}(x)|/\delta)$  and define  $h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') := \text{MAJ}(h(x', R_i) \mid i \in [t])$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  over the choice of  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t$  sampled iid according to  $\mathcal{R}$  we have*

$$\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}) \leq \delta + \varepsilon(\eta),$$

where

$$\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}) = \Pr_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y].$$



*Boosting accuracy via Derandomization:* Given a randomized classifier  $h$ , the procedure detailed in Theorem 3.1, fixes the randomness used during inference beforehand. However, during training, we do not modify  $h$  according to this pre-fixed randomness. It is natural to wonder if this knowledge of the pre-fixed randomness can be used during training to help boost the accuracy. We show in Section 4 that this is indeed the case empirically, by training our classifiers according to the pre-fixed randomness to be used during inference. An interesting question that arises here is whether under suitable assumptions a variant of Theorem 3.1 can be proven to capture the above phenomenon. Currently, Theorem 3.1 prescribes taking a majority vote over multiple instantiations of the original classifier  $h$ , whereas we would like to be able to train a classifier based on the pre-fixed randomness which might result in a classifier not corresponding to any instantiations of  $h$ .

Next we show that it is also possible to derandomize a randomized certification procedure. Suppose we have a classifier  $h$  and a randomized certification mechanism  $\rho$  which on input  $x'$  uses randomness  $R$  (sampled according to  $\mathcal{R}$ ) and outputs a certifiable radius  $\rho(x', R)$ . We define  $\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}$  as the median of  $\rho(R_i)$ 's, i.e.,  $\text{MEDIAN}(\rho(R_i) \mid i \in [t])$  and this serves as our derandomized proxy for the certifiable radius. We show that the behavior of the median is statistically close to the behavior of  $\rho(R)$ . By this we mean the following: for any input  $x'$  let  $\text{ROBUST}(h, x')$  denote a parameter which serves as the measure of the region around  $x'$  where the label according to the classifier  $h$  doesn't change. For instance, this could be the radius of the  $\ell_p$  ball around  $x'$  in which the label according to  $h$  doesn't change. Our certification procedure  $\rho$  serves as an approximation to  $\text{ROBUST}(h, x')$  and it is usually desired that with high probability  $\rho(x', R) \in [(1-\beta) \text{ROBUST}(h, x'), (1+\alpha) \text{ROBUST}(h, x')]$  for some values of  $\beta > 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$  as close to 0 as possible. We are interested in preserving the property that  $\rho(x', R) \in [(1-\beta) \text{ROBUST}(h, x'), (1+\alpha) \text{ROBUST}(h, x')]$ .

**Theorem 3.2** (Derandomizing a certifiably robust classifier). *Let  $h$  be a hypothesis and  $\rho$  be a certification procedure which on input  $x'$  uses randomness  $R \sim \mathcal{R}$  and outputs  $\rho(x', R) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Further, let  $\text{ROBUST}(h, x')$  be as defined above and let  $\gamma(\rho, x, y)$  be defined as*

$$\max_{x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{1} \left[ \frac{\rho(x', R)}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \right] \right]$$

for some positive parameters  $\alpha$ , and  $\beta$ . For any  $0 < \eta < 1/2$  define  $\varepsilon(\eta) := \Pr_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\gamma(\rho, x, y) \geq 1/2 - \eta]$ . Set  $t = \frac{100}{\eta^2} \cdot \log(|\mathcal{A}(x)|/\delta)$  and define  $\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') := \text{MEDIAN}(h(x', R_i) \mid i \in [t])$ . Let  $\gamma(\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}, x, y)$  be defined as

$$\max_{x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{1} \left[ \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \right] \right].$$

Then, with probability  $1 - \delta$  over the choice of  $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t$  sampled iid according to  $\mathcal{R}$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\gamma(\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}, x, y)] \leq \varepsilon(\eta) + \delta.$$

## 4 Experiments

To show the effectiveness of our derandomization method in practice, we implement our framework on the method proposed by Dong and Xu [2023]. They use random projection filters to improve the adversarial robustness. In their method, they replace some of the CNN layers with random filters which are non-trainable, both during training and inference, and by doing so take away some of the adversarial impact on the input. More precisely, they re-instantiate the random filters for each training example and training is done only on the remaining weight parameters of the CNN. Further, during inference time fresh random filters are used. In

contrast, in our method, we fix the random filters to be used (in the style of Theorem 3.1 ) and train a few models with the pre-fixed convolutional filters. This fixing is done randomly at the beginning of the training. During the inference time, we use the majority vote of these trained models on the test input. We follow closely the experimental setup of Dong and Xu [2023] and refer the reader to their paper for further details . Below we outline the setup and our modification to implement the derandomization approach. Codes are publicly available at [https://github.com/TTIC-Adversarial-Robustness/multiple\\_rpf](https://github.com/TTIC-Adversarial-Robustness/multiple_rpf).

## 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets, Models and Computational Resources** We use the CIFAR-10 dataset for our experiments that has 10 categories and contains  $60K$  colored images with size  $32 \times 32$ , including 50K training images and 10K validation. We use the ResNet-18 architecture model on CIFAR-10. The random filters are applied at the first layer where the weights of the random filters are sampled as iid  $N(0, 1/r^2)$  ( $r$  is the Kernel size). The ratio of the random filters to the total number of filters is kept at 0.75 (this parameter is denoted as  $N_r/N$  in Dong and Xu [2023]). For our experiments, we utilized a computing node with 24 cores, 192 GB of system RAM, and 4 NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPUs, each with 11 GB of dedicated VRAM.

**Training Strategy** As we have described earlier, we have multiple models corresponding to each instantiation of the random coins tossed in the beginning. For training a *single* model, as in Dong and Xu [2023] we adhere to the established protocol of a state-of-the-art adversarial training strategy for setting up our experiments on CIFAR-10. The network undergoes training for 200 epochs with a batch size of 128 using SGD with a momentum of 0.9. The learning rate is fixed at 0.1, and the weight decay is set to  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ . Employing a piecewise decay learning rate scheduler, we initiate a decay factor of 0.1 at the  $100^{th}$  and  $150^{th}$  epochs. For generating adversarial examples, we utilize PGD-10 with a maximum perturbation size  $\epsilon = \frac{8}{255}$ , and the step size of PGD is specified as  $\frac{2}{255}$ . Although, the training phase only considers PGD adversarial examples, yet during evaluation we consider other attacks.

**Attacks** To assess the adversarial robustness of our, we utilize Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) Madry et al. [2018a], Fast Gradient Sign Method (FGSM) Szegedy et al. [2013] and Auto Attack Croce and Hein [2020]. Following the standard protocol for attack configuration, we set the maximum perturbation size  $\epsilon$  to  $8/255$  for PGD, FGSM and Auto Attack. For PGD, the step size is established at  $2/255$  over 20 steps.

**Benchmark** We compare various versions of our derandomized majority predictor model where the majority votes are taken over  $n$  base models each initialized with randomly chosen non-trainable filters, with  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 14$ . We also include a comparison with a variant of the model of Dong and Xu [2023] where a majority vote is taken over multiple inferences performed (once, 10, 20 and 30 times) on a single test input using fresh randomness each time (such a model with a majority over 5 votes was considered in Dong and Xu [2023]). This helps us better contrast the accuracy gains due to derandomization.

**Results** We can consistently match and outperform the benchmark by some percentage points in accuracy, even when the majority vote is taken over 30 trials for the benchmark, by just using 11 models with pre-fixed random filters. We tabulate the results in Table 1 below. Further plots detailing the results for varying number of trials can be found in the appendix.

**Conclusion** We studied the new notion of distributional adversarial loss and proved generalization guarantees for it. This notion of adversarial loss unifies two methods for effectively weakening an adversary, adding noise to the input and input discretization. Furthermore, we show a general derandomization technique which

Metric	Majority vote over 11 pre-fixed random filters (our model)	Majority vote over 30 fresh random filters (Dong and Xu [2023])
Natural Acc	0.8603	0.8580
PGD Acc	0.6302	0.6249
FGSM Acc	0.6600	0.6452
Auto Acc	0.6696	0.6591

Table 1: Comparison of Model Performances

preserves the extent of a randomized classifier’s robustness and certification. In terms of further directions, as highlighted in Section 3, it is intriguing to explore the impact of employing pre-fixed randomness in the derandomization process, during training. Does this contribute to enhanced robustness? Our experiments, which incorporate random projection filters, provide some supporting evidence for this notion. Consequently, it prompts further examination across a spectrum of empirically or certifiably robust models.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grants CCF-2212968 and ECCS-2216899, by the Simons Foundation under the Simons Collaboration on the Theory of Algorithmic Fairness, and by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under cooperative agreement HR00112020003. The views expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Government and no official endorsement should be inferred. We thank Anand Bhattad for helpful discussions. Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

## References

- A. Athalye and N. Carlini. On the robustness of the cvpr 2018 white-box adversarial example defenses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03286*, 2018.
- B. Biggio, I. Corona, D. Maiorca, B. Nelson, N. Šrndić, P. Laskov, G. Giacinto, and F. Roli. Evasion attacks against machine learning at test time. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2013, Prague, Czech Republic, September 23-27, 2013, Proceedings, Part III 13*, pages 387–402. Springer, 2013.
- A. Blumer, D. Haussler, and M. K. Warmuth. Learnability and the vapnik-chervonenkis dimension. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 36(4):929–965, 1989.
- Y. Cao, N. Wang, C. Xiao, D. Yang, J. Fang, R. Yang, Q. A. Chen, M. Liu, and B. Li. Invisible for both camera and lidar: Security of multi-sensor fusion based perception in autonomous driving under physical-world attacks. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 176–194. IEEE, 2021.
- N. Carlini and D. Wagner. Adversarial examples are not easily detected: Bypassing ten detection methods. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pages 3–14, 2017.
- J. Chen, X. Wu, V. Rastogi, Y. Liang, and S. Jha. Towards understanding limitations of pixel discretization against adversarial attacks. In *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 480–495. IEEE, 2019.
- J. Cohen, E. Rosenfeld, and Z. Kolter. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1310–1320. PMLR, 2019.

- F. Croce and M. Hein. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2206–2216. PMLR, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/croce20b.html>.
- M. Dong and C. Xu. Adversarial robustness via random projection filters. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4077–4086, 2023.
- S. G. Finlayson, J. D. Bowers, J. Ito, J. L. Zittrain, A. L. Beam, and I. S. Kohane. Adversarial attacks on medical machine learning. *Science*, 363(6433):1287–1289, 2019.
- I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- S. Gowal, K. Dvijotham, R. Stanforth, R. Bunel, C. Qin, J. Uesato, R. Arandjelovic, T. Mann, and P. Kohli. On the effectiveness of interval bound propagation for training verifiably robust models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12715*, 2018.
- A. Kurakin, I. Goodfellow, and S. Bengio. Adversarial machine learning at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01236*, 2016.
- A. J. Levine and S. Feizi. Improved, deterministic smoothing for L1 certified robustness. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6254–6264. PMLR, 2021.
- A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJzIBfZAb>.
- A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018b.
- J. Mohapatra, C.-Y. Ko, T.-W. Weng, P.-Y. Chen, S. Liu, and L. Daniel. Higher-order certification for randomized smoothing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4501–4511, 2020.
- O. Montasser, S. Hanneke, and N. Srebro. Vc classes are adversarially robustly learnable, but only improperly. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2512–2530. PMLR, 2019.
- A. Raghunathan, J. Steinhardt, and P. Liang. Certified defenses against adversarial examples. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- H. Salman, J. Li, I. Razenshteyn, P. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Bubeck, and G. Yang. Provably robust deep learning via adversarially trained smoothed classifiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- C. Szegedy, W. Zaremba, I. Sutskever, J. Bruna, D. Erhan, I. Goodfellow, and R. Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- V. Tjeng, K. Xiao, and R. Tedrake. Evaluating robustness of neural networks with mixed integer programming. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- V. Vapnik and A. Y. Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 16(2):264, 1971.

- E. Wong and Z. Kolter. Provable defenses against adversarial examples via the convex outer adversarial polytope. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5286–5295. PMLR, 2018.
- R. Zhai, C. Dan, D. He, H. Zhang, B. Gong, P. Ravikumar, C.-J. Hsieh, and L. Wang. Macer: Attack-free and scalable robust training via maximizing certified radius. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

## A Potential Broader Impact

Studying robustness to adversarial attacks is crucial since there is a threat that adversarial attacks are deployed in the real world. Making machine learning technologies resistant to adversarial attacks makes machine learning models more reliable to be deployed in areas such as automated driving and healthcare. The methods presented in this paper further our understanding of various mechanisms which enhance the robustness of classifiers.

## B Further Details of Experimental Results

In Figure 1 the blue curve corresponds to the benchmark and the red curve corresponds to our model. The Figures 1(a) to 1(d) denote the performance for various adversaries, namely, no adversary (natural accuracy), FGSM, PGD and Auto Attack. We also collate the results in a bar graph, Figure 1(e).

## C Missing Proofs

### C.1 Proof of Lemma 2.1

*Proof.* For each input  $(x, y)$ , distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  and perturbation  $z \sim u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , define the random variable  $Z_{(x,y,u,z)} = \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y]$ . Let  $Z_{(x,y,u)} = \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y]$ . Let  $\hat{Z}_{(x,y,u)} = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y]$ . By Hoeffding bound, for each example  $(x, y)$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \left| \frac{1}{m} Z_{(x,y,u)} - \hat{Z}_{(x,y,u)} \right| \geq \varepsilon/8 \right] = \Pr \left[ \left| Z_{(x,y,u)} - m \cdot \hat{Z}_{(x,y,u)} \right| \geq \frac{m\varepsilon}{8} \right] \leq 2e^{-2(m\varepsilon/8)^2/m} = 2e^{-\frac{m\varepsilon^2}{32}}$$

Therefore, for a fixed example  $(x, y)$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left| \frac{1}{m} Z_{(x,y,u)} - \hat{Z}_{(x,y,u)} \right| \geq \varepsilon/8 \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{m\varepsilon^2}{32}} \quad (1)$$

which implies that:

$$\Pr \left[ \left| \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} Z_{(x,y,u)} - \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \hat{Z}_{(x,y,u)} \right| \geq \varepsilon/8 \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{m\varepsilon^2}{32}}$$

Therefore, for each input  $(x, y)$ , given  $m \geq 32/\varepsilon^2 \log(200/\varepsilon)$ :

$$\Pr_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} \left[ \left| \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] - \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right| \geq \varepsilon/8 \right] \leq \varepsilon/100 \quad (2)$$

where  $r \sim \mathcal{R}$  is the randomness used for generating  $mk$  perturbations for each  $(x, y) \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D})$ . Let  $Y(x, y)$  be an indicator random variable corresponding to input  $(x, y)$  defined as follows:

$$Y(x, y) = \mathbb{1} \left[ \left| \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] - \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right| > \varepsilon/8 \right]$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] - \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \Pr[Y(x,y) = 1](1) + \Pr[Y(x,y) = 0](\varepsilon/8) \right] = \varepsilon/100 + \varepsilon/8 = 27\varepsilon/200 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Markov's inequality:

$$\Pr_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \right] \leq 54/100 \quad (3)$$

Now, for each input  $(x, y)$ , define the random variable  $f(x, y) = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y]$ . By Hoeffding bound:

$$\Pr_{S'_{\text{clean}} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_{\text{clean}}} f(x, y) - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} f(x, y) \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{8}} \quad (4)$$

Therefore, given  $n \geq 13/\varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} \log(200/6)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{S'_{\text{clean}} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_{\text{clean}}} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \right] \\ & \leq 6/100 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Now, we define bad events

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1 & : \left| \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \\ \mathcal{B}_2 & : \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_{\text{clean}}} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \end{aligned}$$

Putting Equations (3) and (5) together,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{S'_{\text{clean}} \sim \mathcal{D}^n, r \sim \mathcal{R}} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_{\text{clean}}} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon/2 \right] \\ & \leq \Pr_{S'_{\text{clean}} \sim \mathcal{D}^n, r \sim \mathcal{R}} [\mathcal{B}_1 = 1] + \Pr_{S'_{\text{clean}} \sim \mathcal{D}^n, r \sim \mathcal{R}} [\mathcal{B}_2 = 1] \\ & \leq 54/100 + \Pr_{r \sim \mathcal{R}} [r] \cdot \Pr_{S'_{\text{clean}} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} [\mathcal{B}_2 = 1 | r] \\ & \leq 54/100 + 6/100 = 3/5 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where Equation (6) holds for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . Now,  $\Pr(B) \geq \Pr(A, B) = \Pr(A) \Pr(B|A)$ . Consider drawing set  $S$  and suppose event  $A$  occurs. Let  $h$  be in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_{\text{clean}}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap S_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] = 0$$

By Equation (6), given  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon$ , when  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \cdot \log(1/\varepsilon))$ ,  $n = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2)$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_{\text{clean}}} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_{\text{perturb}}} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \leq \varepsilon/2 \right] \leq 3/5$$

Thus,  $\Pr(B|A) \geq 2/5$  and  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$  as desired.  $\square$

## C.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

*Proof.* Consider drawing a set  $S_c$  of  $n$  examples from  $\mathcal{D}$  and then for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ , add  $m$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  to  $S_p$  and let  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Define  $A$  as the event where there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) > \varepsilon$  but  $\text{DAL}_S(h) = 0$ . By Lemma 2.1, it suffices to prove that  $\Pr(B) \leq (2/5)\delta$ , where  $B$  is the same event as defined in Lemma 2.1. Consider a third experiment. Draw a set  $S''_c$  of  $2n$  points from  $\mathcal{D}$  and then augment each natural example  $(x, y)$  by adding  $mk$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  to get a set  $S''$ . Now, in fact, the set  $S'' = \{B_1, \dots, B_{2n}\}$  where each  $B_i \in S''$  is a ball around the  $i^{\text{th}}$  clean example in  $S''_c$  that contains the  $i^{\text{th}}$  clean example and all its  $m \cdot k$  perturbations. Next, randomly partition  $S''$  into two sets  $S$  and  $S'$  of  $n$  balls each.

Let  $B^*$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $\text{DAL}_S(h) = 0$  but  $\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) \geq \varepsilon/2$ .  $\Pr(B^*) = \Pr(B)$  since drawing  $2n$  points from  $\mathcal{D}$  then augmenting them by adding  $m \cdot k$  perturbations per each natural example, and randomly partitioning them into two sets of size  $n$ , results in the same distribution on  $(S, S')$  as does drawing  $S$  and  $S'$  directly. The advantage of this new experiment is that we can now argue that  $\Pr(B^*)$  is low, with probability now taken over just the random partition of  $S''$  into  $S$  and  $S'$ . The key point is that since  $S''$  is fixed, there are at most  $|\mathcal{H}[S'']| \leq \mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k]$  events to worry about. Specifically, it suffices to prove that for any fixed  $h \in \mathcal{H}[S'']$ , the probability over the partition of  $S''$  that  $h$  makes zero distributional adversarial loss on  $S$  but  $\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) \geq \varepsilon/2$  is at most  $2\delta/(5\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k])$ . We can then apply the union bound.

Consider the following specific method for partitioning  $S''$  into  $S$  and  $S'$ . Randomly put the balls in  $S''$  into pairs:  $(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), \dots, (a_n, b_n)$ . For each index  $i$ , flip a fair coin. If heads put  $a_i$  in  $S$  and  $b_i$  into  $S'$ , else if tails put  $a_i$  into  $S'$  and  $b_i$  into  $S$ . Now, fix some partition  $h \in \mathcal{H}[S'']$  and consider the probability over these  $n$  fair coin flips such  $\text{DAL}_S(h) = 0$  that but  $\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) \geq \varepsilon/2$ . First of all, if for any index  $i$ ,  $h$  makes a robustness mistake, i.e. a mistake on any examples inside a ball, on both  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  then the probability is zero (because it cannot have zero robust loss on  $S$ ). Second, if there are fewer than  $\varepsilon n/2$  indices  $i$  such that  $h$  makes a robustness mistake on either  $a_i$  or  $b_i$  then again the probability is zero because it cannot possibly be the case that  $\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) \geq \varepsilon/2$ . So, assume there are  $r \geq \varepsilon n/2$  indices  $i$  such that  $h$  makes a robustness mistake on exactly one of  $a_i$  or  $b_i$ . In this case, the chance that all of those mistakes land in  $S'$  is exactly  $1/2^r$ . This quantity is at most  $1/2^{\varepsilon n/2} \leq 2\delta/(5\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k])$  as desired for  $n$  given in the theorem statement.  $\square$

## C.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

*Proof.* We use Sauer's Lemma and Theorem 2.2 to complete the proof.

Using Sauer's lemma, we have that for  $\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k] \leq (2enmk/d)^d$ . From Theorem 2.2 we have the following:

$$n \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \left[ \log(2\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k]) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{7}{\varepsilon} \right]$$



Combining with Sauer's lemma implies that:

$$n \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \left[ \log(2 \left( \frac{2enmk}{d} \right)^d) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{7}{\varepsilon} \right]$$

Therefore,

$$n \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \left[ d \log(n) + d \log(2emk/d) + d \log(2) + \log(1/\delta) + \frac{7}{\varepsilon} \right]$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to have:

$$n \geq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \left[ d \log(n) + d \log(2emk/d) + d + \log(1/\delta) + \frac{7}{\varepsilon} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$n \geq \frac{2d}{\varepsilon} \log(n) + \frac{2d}{\varepsilon} \log(2emk/d) + \frac{2d}{\varepsilon} + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \log(1/\delta) + \frac{14}{\varepsilon^2} \quad (8)$$

In order to have  $x \geq a \log(x) + b$  it is sufficient to have  $x \geq 4a \log(2a) + 2b$ . Therefore, in order to have Equation (12), it is sufficient to have:

$$n \geq \frac{8d}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{8d}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{4d}{\varepsilon} \log(2emk/d) + \frac{4d}{\varepsilon} + \frac{4}{\varepsilon} \log(1/\delta) + \frac{28}{\varepsilon^2}$$

And it is sufficient to have:

$$n \geq \frac{8d}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{16demk}{d\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{4d}{\varepsilon} + \frac{4}{\varepsilon} \log(1/\delta) + \frac{28}{\varepsilon^2}$$

Therefore:

$$n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot d \log\left(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$$

□

#### C.4 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Putting together Lemma C.1 and Theorem C.1 proves Theorem 2.3 holds. Similar to Lemma 2.1, we prove the following lemma in the agnostic case.

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a concept class over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S_c$  and  $S'_c$  be sets of  $n$  elements drawn from some distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $n \geq 13/\varepsilon^2$ . For each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  are added to a set  $S_p$  and finally  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Similarly,  $S'_c$  is augmented to get  $S'$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon$ . Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon/2$ . Then  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .*

*Proof.* We need to follow an approach similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1 with a minor modification in the last step. Similar to Equation (6), we have for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\Pr_{\substack{S'_c \sim \mathcal{D}^n, \\ r \sim \mathcal{R}}} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_c} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in u \cap S'_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon/2 \right] \geq 2/5 \quad (9)$$

which is same as saying:

$$\Pr \left[ |\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_{S'}(h)| \leq \varepsilon/2 \right] \geq 2/5 \quad (10)$$

Now,  $\Pr(B) \geq \Pr(A, B) = \Pr(A) \Pr(B|A)$ . Consider drawing set  $S$  and suppose event  $A$  occurs, let  $h$  be in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon$ . By triangle's inequality and Equation (10),  $\Pr(B|A) = \Pr[|\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon/2 | A] \geq 2/5$ . Therefore, we can conclude that  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

□

**Theorem C.1.** For any class  $\mathcal{H}$  and distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , a training sample  $S_c$  of size

$$n \geq \frac{13}{\varepsilon^2} [\log(5\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k]) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})]$$

where for each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations are sampled from each of the distributions  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Let  $S_p$  denote the set of all perturbations, then  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Let  $k = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{U}(x)$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , every  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  will have  $|\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \leq \varepsilon$ .

*Proof of Theorem C.1.* By Lemma C.1, it suffices to prove  $\Pr(B) \leq (2/5)\delta$ . Consider a third experiment. Draw a set  $S_c''$  of  $2n$  points from  $\mathcal{D}$  and then augment each natural example  $(x, y)$  by adding  $m \cdot k$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  to get a set  $S''$ . Now, in fact, the set  $S'' = \{B_1, \dots, B_{2n}\}$  where each  $B_i \in S''$  is a ball around the  $i^{\text{th}}$  clean example in  $S_c''$  that contains the  $i^{\text{th}}$  clean example and all its  $m \cdot k$  perturbations. Next, randomly partition  $S''$  into two sets  $S$  and  $S'$  of  $n$  balls each.

Let  $B^*$  be the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}[S'']$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_S(h) - \text{DAL}_{S'}(h)| > \varepsilon/2$ . Consider an experiment where we randomly put the balls in  $S''$  into pairs  $(a_i, b_i)$ . For each index  $i$ , flip a fair coin. If heads put  $a_i$  in  $S$  and  $b_i$  into  $S'$ , else if tails put  $a_i$  into  $S'$  and  $b_i$  into  $S$ . Consider the the value of  $\text{DAL}_{S'} - \text{DAL}_S$  and see how it changes as we flip coins for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Initially, the difference is zero. For a fixed pair  $(a_i, b_i)$ , suppose the difference between  $\text{DAL}_{a_i}(h) - \text{DAL}_{b_i}(h) = \eta$  for some value of  $\eta$  between  $[-1, 1]$ . When the  $i^{\text{th}}$  random coin is flipped, the difference  $\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)$  increases by  $\eta$  with probability  $1/2$  and decreases by  $\eta$  with probability  $1/2$ . The probability that when taking a random walk of  $n$  steps where each step has a length of at most 1, we end up more than  $\varepsilon n/2$  steps away from the origin, is at the most the probability that among  $n$  coin flips the number of heads differs from its expectation by more than  $\varepsilon n/4$ . By Hoeffding bounds, this is at most  $2e^{-\varepsilon^2 n/8}$ . This quantity is at most  $2\delta/5\mathcal{H}[2nmk]$  as desired for  $n \geq (8/\varepsilon^2)(\log(5\mathcal{H}[2nmk]) + \log(1/\delta))$ . By applying union bound,  $\Pr(B) \leq (2/5)\delta$ . By applying Lemma C.1, since  $n \geq 13/\varepsilon^2$  and  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$ ,  $\Pr(A) \leq (5/2)\Pr(B)$  which implies that  $\Pr(A) \leq \delta$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.* We use Sauer's Lemma and Theorem C.1 to complete the proof.

Using Sauer's lemma, we have that for  $\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k] \leq (2enmk/d)^d$ . From Theorem C.1 we have the following:

$$n \geq \frac{13}{\varepsilon^2} [\log(2\mathcal{H}[2n \cdot m \cdot k]) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})]$$

Combining with Sauer's lemma implies that:

$$n \geq \frac{13}{\varepsilon^2} [\log(2(\frac{2enmk}{d})^d) + \log(\frac{1}{\delta})]$$

Therefore,

$$n \geq \frac{13}{\varepsilon^2} [d \log(n) + d \log(2emk/d) + d \log(2) + \log(1/\delta)]$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to have:

$$n \geq \frac{13}{\varepsilon^2} [d \log(n) + d \log(2emk/d) + d + \log(1/\delta)] \quad (11)$$

$$n \geq \frac{13d}{\varepsilon^2} \log(n) + \frac{13d}{\varepsilon^2} \log(2emk/d) + \frac{13d}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{13}{\varepsilon^2} \log(1/\delta) \quad (12)$$

In order to have  $x \geq a \log(x) + b$  it is sufficient to have  $x \geq 4a \log(2a) + 2b$ . Therefore, in order to have Equation (12), it is sufficient to have:

$$n \geq \frac{52d}{\varepsilon^2} \log(\frac{26d}{\varepsilon^2}) + \frac{26d}{\varepsilon^2} \log(2emk/d) + \frac{26d}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{26}{\varepsilon^2} \log(1/\delta)$$

And it is sufficient to have:

$$n \geq \frac{52d}{\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{52demk}{d\varepsilon^2}\right) + \frac{26d}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{26}{\varepsilon^2} \log(1/\delta)$$

Therefore:

$$n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot d \log\left(\frac{mk}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$$

□

## C.5 Proof of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* In order to prove Theorem 2.4, the key idea is to prove Lemma C.2, which states the following: Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero empirical distributional adversarial error on  $S$  (with respect to the representative perturbation sets  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ ) but true distributional adversarial error at least  $\varepsilon$  (with respect to the true perturbation sets  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ ). Now draw a *fresh* test set  $S'$  of  $n$  examples from  $\mathcal{D}$  where for each example  $(x, y) \in S'$ ,  $m$  perturbations are drawn from each distribution  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  and are added to  $S'$ . Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero distributional adversarial loss on  $S$  but distributional adversarial loss at least  $\varepsilon/2$  on  $S'$ . We prove that  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

**Lemma C.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a concept class over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S_c$  and  $S'_c$  be sets of  $n$  elements drawn from some distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $n = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2)$ . For each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  are added to a set  $S_p$  and finally  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Similarly,  $S'_c$  is augmented to get  $S'$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero empirical distributional adversarial error on  $S$  but true distributional adversarial error  $\geq \varepsilon + \varepsilon'$ :*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon + \varepsilon', \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] = 0$$

Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero distributional adversarial loss on  $S$  but distributional adversarial loss  $\geq \varepsilon/2$  on  $S'$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap S'_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] &\geq \varepsilon/2, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

*Proof of Lemma C.2.* Suppose event  $A$  happens, and let  $h$  be in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon + \varepsilon'$ . Let  $f$  be a function that maps an input  $(x, y)$  to a distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  with maximum error given classifier  $h$ :

$$f : (x, y) \rightarrow u \in \mathcal{U}(x) : u = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y]$$

, and

$$f' : (x, y) \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}(x) : r = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathcal{R}(x)} TV(r, f(x, y))$$

Given event  $A$ , we know:

$$\varepsilon + \varepsilon' \leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim f(x,y)} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim f'(x,y)} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] + \varepsilon' \quad (13)$$

Therefore:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim f'(x,y)} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \geq \varepsilon \quad (14)$$

which implies that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon \quad (15)$$

Combining Equation (15) with Lemma 2.1 implies that event  $B$  happens with probability at least  $(2/5) \Pr(A)$ .  $\square$

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.4 is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1. First, we use the application of Lemma C.2 to argue about the distributional adversarial loss on the test data with perturbations generated from representative distributions  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$  instead of population distributional adversarial loss with respect to  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ . Furthermore, similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2, we can show that for large enough test and training data coming from the same distribution, it cannot be the case that there is a large gap between training and test distributional adversarial loss. In the end, the application of Sauer's lemma similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.5.* In the agnostic case, first similar to Lemma C.2, we can show the following lemma holds.

**Lemma C.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a concept class over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S_c$  and  $S'_c$  be sets of  $n$  elements drawn from some distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $n \geq 13/\varepsilon^2$ . For each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  are added to a set  $S_p$  and finally  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Similarly,  $S'_c$  is augmented to get  $S'$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon + \varepsilon'$ . Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon/2$ . Then  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .*

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.5 is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.3. First, we use the application of Lemma C.3 to argue about the distributional adversarial loss on the test data with perturbations generated from representative distributions  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$  instead of population distributional adversarial loss with respect to  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ . Furthermore, similar to the proof of Theorem C.1, we can show that for large enough test and training data coming from the same distribution, it cannot be the case that there is a large gap between training and test distributional adversarial loss. In the end, the application of Sauer's lemma similar to the proof of Theorem 2.3 completes the proof.  $\square$

## C.6 Proof of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.* In order to prove Theorem 2.6 holds, first we prove the following lemma:

**Lemma C.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a concept class over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S_c$  and  $S'_c$  be sets of  $n$  elements drawn from some distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $n = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2)$ . For each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  are added to a set  $S_p$  and finally  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Similarly,  $S'_c$  is augmented to*

get  $S'$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero empirical distributional adversarial error on  $S$  but true distributional adversarial error  $\geq k\varepsilon$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] &\geq k\varepsilon, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  with zero distributional adversarial loss on  $S$  but distributional adversarial loss  $\geq \varepsilon/2$  on  $S'$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S'_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap S'_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] &\geq \varepsilon/2, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(x,y) \in S_c} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap S_p} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

*Proof of Lemma C.4.* Suppose event  $A$  happens, and let  $h$  be in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq k\varepsilon$ . Let  $f$  be a function that maps an input  $(x, y)$  to a distribution  $u \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  with maximum error given classifier  $h$ :

$$f : (x, y) \rightarrow u \in \mathcal{U}(x) : u = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{U}(x)} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y],$$

and

$$f' : (x, y) \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}(x) : r \text{ has the maximum coverage of the error region of } f(x, y)$$

Given event  $A$ , we know:

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim f(x,y)} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim f'(x,y)} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \quad (16)$$

where the last inequality holds by the pigeon-hole principle. Therefore  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim f'(x,y)} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \geq \varepsilon$ , which implies that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(x)} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{z \sim u} \mathbb{1}[h(z) \neq y] \right] \right] \geq \varepsilon$$

Combining it with Lemma 2.1 implies that event  $B$  happens with probability at least  $(2/5) \Pr(A)$ .  $\square$

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.6 is similar to Theorem 2.1. First, we use the application of Lemma C.4 to argue about the distributional adversarial loss on the test data with perturbations generated from representative distributions  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$  instead of population distributional adversarial loss with respect to  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ . Furthermore, similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2, we can show that for large enough test and training data coming from the same distribution, it cannot be the case that there is a large gap between training and test distributional adversarial loss. In the end, the application of Sauer's lemma similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.7.* In the agnostic case, first similar to Lemma C.4 we can show the following lemma holds:

**Lemma C.5.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a concept class over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S_c$  and  $S'_c$  be sets of  $n$  elements drawn from some distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $n \geq 13/\varepsilon^2$ . For each  $(x, y) \in S_c$ ,  $m = \Omega(1/\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon))$  perturbations sampled from each  $u \in \mathcal{R}(x)$  are added to a set  $S_p$  and finally  $S = S_c \cup S_p$ . Similarly,  $S'_c$  is augmented to get  $S'$ . Let  $A$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq k\varepsilon$ . Let  $B$  denote the event that there exists  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $|\text{DAL}_{S'}(h) - \text{DAL}_S(h)| \geq \varepsilon/2$ . Then  $\Pr(B) \geq (2/5) \Pr(A)$ .

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2.7 is similar to the proof Theorem 2.3. First, we use the application of Lemma C.5 to argue about the distributional adversarial loss on the test data with perturbations generated from representative distributions  $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$  instead of population distributional adversarial loss with respect to  $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ . Furthermore, similar to the proof of Theorem C.1, we can show that for large enough test and training data coming from the same distribution, it cannot be the case that there is a large gap between training and test distributional adversarial loss. In the end, the application of Sauer's lemma similar to the proof of Theorem 2.3 completes the proof.  $\square$

### C.7 Proof of Theorem 3.1

*Proof.* Fix a sample  $(x, y)$  such that  $\varepsilon(x, y) \leq 1/2 - \eta$ . We will show that

$$\Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y] \leq \delta.$$

For this fix we fix an  $x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)$  and analyze

$$\Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} [h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y].$$

Notice that  $\Pr_{R \sim \mathcal{R}} [h(x', R) \neq y] \leq 1/2 - \eta$  and therefore by the Chernoff bound we have

$$\Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} [h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y] \leq \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{1}[h(x, R_i) \neq y] \geq t/2 \right] \leq \exp(-2\eta^2 t).$$

Finally, by a union bound over the set  $\mathcal{A}(x)$  we have

$$\Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y] \leq |\mathcal{A}(x)| \cdot \exp(-2\eta^2 t) \leq \delta^2.$$

Since, this is true for any fixed  $(x, y)$  such that  $\varepsilon(x, y) \leq 1/2 - \eta$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t}} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y | \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta] \leq \delta^2,$$

and by Markov's inequality this yields

$$\Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y | \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta] \geq \delta \right] \leq \delta.$$

Our desired claim follows by noting that when  $(x, y)$  is sampled from  $\mathcal{D}$ , then with probability at most  $\varepsilon(\eta)$  we have  $\varepsilon(x, y) > 1/2 - \eta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y] \geq \varepsilon(\eta) + \delta \right] \leq \\ & \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \varepsilon(\eta) + \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y | \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta] \geq \varepsilon(\eta) + \delta \right] \leq \\ & \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : h^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x') \neq y | \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta] \geq \delta \right] \leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### C.8 Proof of Theorem 3.2

*Proof.* Fix a sample  $(x, y)$  such that  $\gamma(\rho, x, y) \leq 1/2 - \eta$ . We will show that

$$\Pr_{R_1, \dots, R_t} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \right] \leq \delta.$$

For this consider a fixed  $x' \in \mathcal{A}(x)$ . Notice that

$$\Pr_{R \sim \mathcal{R}} \left[ \frac{\rho(x', R)}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \right] \leq 1/2 - \eta.$$

Therefore, by the Chernoff bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{R_1, \dots, R_t} \left[ \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \right] \leq \\ & \Pr_{R_1, \dots, R_t} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{1} \left[ \frac{\rho(x', R_i)}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \leq 1 - \beta \right] \geq t/2 \right] + \Pr_{R_1, \dots, R_t} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{1} \left[ \frac{\rho(x', R_i)}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \geq 1 + \alpha \right] \geq t/2 \right] \leq 2 \cdot \exp(-2\eta^2 t). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by a union bound over  $\mathcal{A}(x)$  we have

$$\Pr_{R_1, \dots, R_t} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \right] \leq 2|\mathcal{A}(x)| \cdot \exp(-2\eta^2 t) \leq \delta^2.$$

Since, this is true for any fixed  $(x, y)$  such that  $\varepsilon(x, y) \leq 1/2 - \eta$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t}} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \mid \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta \right] \leq \delta^2,$$



and by Markov's inequality this yields

$$\Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \mid \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta \right] \geq \delta \right] \leq \delta.$$

Our desired claim follows by noting that when  $(x, y)$  is sampled from  $\mathcal{D}$ , then with probability at most  $\varepsilon(\eta)$  we have  $\varepsilon(x, y) > 1/2 - \eta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \geq \varepsilon(\eta) + \delta \right] \leq \right. \\ & \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \varepsilon(\eta) + \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \mid \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta \right] \geq \varepsilon(\eta) + \delta \right] \leq \\ & \Pr_{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \exists x' \in \mathcal{A}(x) : \frac{\rho^{(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_t)}(x')}{\text{ROBUST}(h, x')} \notin [1 - \beta, 1 + \alpha] \mid \varepsilon(x, y) < 1/2 - \eta \right] \geq \delta \right] \leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

□



(e) Bar graph comparing our model against the benchmark for various adversaries: blocks 1, 3 and 5 correspond to the number of derandomized models used, where as blocks 2 and 5 correspond to the number of trails by the benchmark model

Figure 1: Results of derandomizing the Random Projection Filters framework of Dong and Xu [2023] using Theorem 3.1. The red and blue curves correspond to the derandomized model and the benchmark respectively.