

Context-Aware Fuzzing for Robustness Enhancement of Deep Learning Models

HAIPENG WANG, City University of Hong Kong, China

ZHENGYUAN WEI, City University of Hong Kong, China

QILIN ZHOU, City University of Hong Kong, China

WING KWONG CHAN*, City University of Hong Kong, China

In the testing-retraining pipeline for enhancing the robustness property of deep learning (DL) models, many state-of-the-art robustness-oriented fuzzing techniques are metric-oriented. The pipeline generates adversarial examples as test cases via such a DL testing technique and retrains the DL model under test with test suites that contain these test cases. On the one hand, the strategies of these fuzzing techniques tightly integrate the key characteristics of their testing metrics. On the other hand, they are often unaware of whether their generated test cases are different from the samples surrounding these test cases and whether there are relevant test cases of other seeds when generating the current one. We propose a novel testing metric called *Contextual Confidence* (CC). CC measures a test case through the surrounding samples of a test case in terms of their mean probability predicted to the prediction label of the test case. Based on this metric, we further propose a novel fuzzing technique CLOVER as a DL testing technique for the pipeline. In each fuzzing round, CLOVER first finds a set of seeds whose labels are the same as the label of the seed under fuzzing. At the same time, it locates the corresponding test case that achieves the highest CC values among the existing test cases of each seed in this set of seeds and shares the same prediction label as the existing test case of the seed under fuzzing that achieves the highest CC value. CLOVER computes the piece of difference between each such pair of a seed and a test case. It incrementally applies these pieces of differences to perturb the current test case of the seed under fuzzing that achieves the highest CC value and to perturb the resulting samples along the gradient to generate new test cases for the seed under fuzzing. CLOVER finally selects test cases among the generated test cases of all seeds as even as possible and with a preference to select test cases with higher CC values for improving model robustness. The experiments show that CLOVER outperforms the state-of-the-art coverage-based technique ADAPT and loss-based fuzzing technique ROBOT by 67%–129% and 48%–100% in terms of robustness improvement ratio, respectively, delivered through the same testing-retraining pipeline. For test case generation, in terms of numbers of unique adversarial labels and unique categories for the constructed test suites, CLOVER outperforms ADAPT by 2.0× and 3.5× and ROBOT by 1.6× and 1.7× on fuzzing clean models, and also outperforms ADAPT by 3.4× and 4.5× and ROBOT by 9.8× and 11.0× on fuzzing adversarially trained models, respectively.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging**; • **Networks** → **Network reliability**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: context-awareness, fuzzing algorithm, robustness, assessment, metric

1 INTRODUCTION

Deep learning (DL) has been widely applied in many application domains, such as autonomous driving systems [90, 94], protein structure prediction [55, 57], and healthcare [17, 39, 60]. However, it is well-known that even slight perturbations on clean samples may trigger DL models to misbehave. If an application adopts a DL software component with inadequate ability to protect against adversarial examples, it can lead to severe consequences (e.g., accidents with causality [34, 98] in the domain of autonomous driving).

*Corresponding Author

The official version of this paper is to appear in ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (accepted in July 2024).
 Authors' addresses: HAIPENG WANG, haipewang5-c@my.cityu.edu.hk, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China; ZHENGYUAN WEI, zywei4-c@my.cityu.edu.hk, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China; QILIN ZHOU, qilin.zhou@my.cityu.edu.hk, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China; WING KWONG CHAN, wkchan@cityu.edu.hk, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China.

A popular way to rectify model misbehavior with respect to the robustness (i.e., the concerned quality attribute of the model under test) is to retrain the concerned DL model with a mixture of the original training data and those failing test cases that trigger the misbehavior of the DL model. The pipeline of generating failing test cases for the DL model under test followed by retraining the model with the original training data and a test suite that contains these test cases [70], which we refer to as the *testing-retraining pipeline* or the pipeline for short, presents a scenario different from how test cases in traditional testing on traditional programs (e.g., C++/Java programs) assist in program testing [47], repair [76], and retesting [53]. In the traditional program testing domain, typically, (failing) test cases that expose failures are also used to retest the repaired programs to validate that the repaired programs can pass them. Thus, developers can use test cases for at least two purposes: failure exposure of the program under test and validation of the behavior of the repaired program. In particular, the retest task on the repaired program with these test cases meaningfully serves the purpose of validating the behavior of the repaired program, albeit the validation also uses the inputs that the program under test should pass. Furthermore, developers often use these test cases for the program repair task between the test and retest tasks.

In the DL model testing domain, however, if a DL model has been retrained with the test cases produced by a DL testing technique (e.g., ROBOT [70]) so that the expected prediction for the test cases should be learned, the resulting retrained DL model has been taught to fit its behavior to these trained (and originally failing) test cases well due to the memorization effect [10, 26] of the DL model through a retraining process. Thus, retesting the retrained model with these test cases becomes not very meaningful (and is likely misleading to indicate the extent of robustness improvement achieved by the retrained model). To address this issue, apart from using the testing-retraining pipeline, developers validate the DL model under test and the retrained model with a standalone set of samples (which we refer to as the *robust validation dataset*) that can be provided by users or generated by some standalone techniques probably independent of the DL testing technique in the pipeline [70]¹.

In other words, a DL testing technique in the pipeline has at least two main purposes: failure exposure from the DL model under test and supplying test cases for model retraining for the purpose of improving the robustness property of the DL model under test. Since the role of validation has been taken up by a robust validation dataset in the overall workflow [70], like the related works [15, 19, 23, 32, 44, 68, 70, 93] in the software engineering (SE) literature, one of the main values of a DL testing technique in the pipeline is to generate test cases for model retraining to mitigate the threat of inadequate robustness generalized from these test cases exposed by the DL testing technique. To know the relative impact of the test cases on the robustness property of the DL model under test, the robust accuracies before and after the retraining task can be compared to ensure that a gain in robust accuracy can be observed after model retraining, which serves as a validation of whether the test cases producible by the DL testing technique can lead to positive effects on the robustness property of the DL model under test delivered through the pipeline. For instance, the QUOTE framework [15] presents a workflow with the testing-retraining pipeline, where the workflow applies the pipeline to generate test cases via a DL fuzzing technique (e.g., ROBOT [70]) guided by a testing metric followed by retraining the DL model using a set of these test cases and the original training dataset. After that, the workflow measures the robust

¹We note that a testing-retraining pipeline (e.g., the ones presented in experiments such as [19, 22, 70, 87]) targets to smooth those “bugs” (model misclassification behavior exposed by adversarial examples generated by the DL testing technique in the pipeline) by a retraining process. There are other types of “bugs”, such as code implementation bugs, platform bugs, and buggy (non-optimized) neural network architecture. These “bugs” are exposed and improved by other pipelines/workflows with other types of SE techniques: E.g., AutoTrainer [92] for training issues that prevent a training process from normal execution or updating the weights, Duo [91] for testing the presence of bugs in DL libraries, DeepDiagnosis [73] for performance bug detection, and DeepPatch [75] and DeepRepair [87] for patching the network architecture or smoothing the parameters to produce the ones with higher performance for accuracy-robustness tradeoff, to name a few. Fuzzing techniques, including our proposed one, complement these works to make the testing of DL models for the improvement of respective quality attributes via the respective pipelines more comprehensive.

accuracy improvement achieved by the retrained model on a standalone robust validation dataset (which is a dataset generated by attacker techniques [24, 45] or fuzzing techniques [25, 36]).

Indeed, there has been great interest in the SE community to formulate SE techniques aiming at quality assurance and improvement of DL models via testing [15]. Among those quality attributes for DL models, robustness is widely studied by the community to address threats like adversarial examples by generating test cases and improving the robustness of DL models with these test cases delivered through testing-retraining pipelines [14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 30, 36, 40, 44, 66, 70, 75, 84, 87, 90].

To help developers assess the quality of DL models with the aim of enhancing the robustness property of DL models, apart from DL testing techniques, DL verification techniques [12, 37, 46] are also under active research. DL verification techniques, such as formal verification [46], approximation verification [37], statistical verification [12], and certification [31, 95, 96], check whether a DL model satisfies or violates a given sample-level property and provide a strong guarantee for a verified sample. But, verifying an arbitrary DL model for all possible inputs remains an open problem.

Recently, DL testing techniques [15, 19, 23, 25, 32, 44, 50, 68, 70] with the purpose of robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline are emerging to give insights into how to judge samples more likely to carry informative clues for the misbehavior or robustness of DL models under test.

In particular, many fuzzing techniques (e.g., [15, 23, 50, 70, 86]), as a kind of DL testing technique, in such pipelines exhibit at least two key characteristics [15]. First, they include a testing metric to assess a given testing property of a test case or a test suite. Existing works have formulated both coverage-based testing metrics, such as measuring the number of neurons activated in the forward pass for a test case or a test suite (aka measuring the neuron coverage) [36, 50] and non-coverage-based ones, such as measuring the loss value of a test case (but the loss values of different test cases are independent with one another) [23, 70]. They select or generate samples by increasing the selective coverage over internal neural network states (e.g., neurons in [36, 50] and outliers in [32]), selecting a subset among many variants of the same seed (e.g., variants incurring largest absolute [23] and smallest relative [15, 70] losses), or distinguishing more or diverse model mutants [30, 41, 72, 74].

The second characteristic is to use the testing metrics to guide their procedures for various testing steps, such as seed selection [84], sample mutation [30], or the number of evolution attempts [70]. However, applying coverage-based testing metrics to guide DL testing techniques may not be consistently effective. Existing empirical findings show that their adopted coverage criteria could be either too easy to satisfy or require demanding tuning to reach high coverage rates [19, 27]. Still, the correlations between the coverage achieved by a test suite constructed by these techniques and the failure proneness of the test suite demonstrated via their testing-retraining pipelines are weak, and the robustness improvement is small [38, 85]. Loss-based fuzzing techniques [15, 23, 70] gradually evolve individual seeds toward the side of larger values of an adopted loss function. They deem the generated samples with either the largest absolute loss [23] or the smallest relative loss [15, 70] to be test cases of higher quality or pick test cases from different parts of an ordered set of test cases (e.g., via the KM-ST strategy in [70]). For instance, in our experiment (Section 5), we have compared KM-ST using its original loss-based metric (known as the first-order loss) [70] with random selection over the same pool of adversarial examples (aka a pool of test cases) using the same testing-retraining pipeline for robustness improvement. We find that their effects on robust accuracy improvement are similar to each other, indicating that the guiding effect of using the loss-based testing metric may not be observable compared to the random selection, which is consistent with the previous finding that “the Random selection strategy performs surprisingly well in some cases, which is close to KM-ST” expressed by Chen et al. on discussing their experimental results [15]. Mutation-based fuzzing techniques [74, 91] are computationally expensive.




Fig. 1. Illustration for Calculating CC Values for Different Test Cases Generated from the Same Seed.

Following the fuzzing works [23, 25, 50, 68, 70] for DL testing techniques in the literature, in this paper, we adopt the testing-retraining pipeline with the purpose of improving the robustness property of DL models via testing to be the scope of our proposed technique. We focus on the DL testing technique in the pipeline. We refer to the robustness improvement achieved by the retrained model with the test suite constructed by a DL testing technique and the original training dataset as the robustness improvement delivered through the pipeline.

We propose CLOVER, a novel fuzzing technique for DL testing. The technique is built on two main ideas.

First, we design a novel testing metric called *Contextual Confidence*, CC for short (see Eq. (1)) – CC measures a test case through the consensus achieved by the surrounding samples of a test case, which is their mean probability predicted to the prediction label of the test case. Like the testing metric in DeepGini [19], CC is a black-box non-coverage-based metric. The general background of CC is that it is pretty easy for an iterative gradient-based strategy (e.g., PGD [45]) to generate many test cases with high prediction confidence (e.g., very close to 1) from the given samples if time allows. Our insight is that adding small uniform perturbations [23, 30, 41] to a test case of a seed can easily and efficiently produce perturbed samples with different degrees of consensus with respect to the test case that produces them, and some test cases generated from a seed may obtain a stronger consensus (in the sense of higher CC value) than some other test cases of the same seed. Suppose a DL model is confident in predicting the labels of some test cases. In that case, those test cases with higher CC values likely indicate higher chances that the DL model generalizes its predictions from these test cases to their surrounding samples. (Our experimental result in Section 5 also shows that the test suite construction strategy that prefers test cases with higher CC values significantly outperforms random selection in robustness improvement delivered through the pipeline.)

Fig. 1 illustrates how to calculate the CC values for different test cases depicted by filled circles (i.e., t_1 and t_2) generated from the same fuzzing seed x depicted by an empty circle. The vector, in the style of $\vec{f}(s)$, depicts the prediction vector of a DL model f on predicting the label of a sample s . It has three values standing for the probabilities of three classes (1, 2, and 3). The prediction labels of x , t_1 , and t_2 are 2, 1, and 1, respectively. We refer to a test case’s prediction label as the test case’s *adversarial label*. The samples (perturbed test cases) surrounding t_1 and t_2 are depicted by dashed filled circles: t_1^1 , t_1^2 , and t_1^3 for t_1 ; and t_2^1 , t_2^2 , and t_2^3 for t_2 . The prediction probabilities of the three samples surrounding t_1 for the adversarial label of t_1 (i.e., class 1) are 0.90, 0.11, and 0.70. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the CC value for t_1 is computed as 0.57. Similarly, the CC value for t_2 is computed as 0.82. The example illustrates that the two test cases have the same prediction vector, but their CC values could be quite different.

Second, we aim to evolve a test case of a seed (under fuzzing in the current fuzzing round) with a lower CC value into a test case (of the same seed) with a higher CC value incrementally. As such, we can choose the latter test case instead of the former one in constructing a test suite for improving the robustness property of the DL models. Specifically, to generate test cases in the current fuzzing round on a seed (denoted by x), we first retrieve the test case that yields the highest CC value among all already generated test cases of the seed x . We further retrieve the seeds that are “similar” to x : their labels are the same as the label of x , and their test cases with the highest CC values are all predicted to the same prediction label of the above test case of x . We refer to these seeds as seed-equivalent to one another at the current fuzzing round. We then find the piece of difference for each such seed-equivalent seed of x (denoted by y) by subtracting the seed y from the test case that yields the highest CC value among all already generated test cases of the seed y (denoted by \bar{y}), which determines the seed being seed-equivalent to x , i.e., the difference is $\bar{y} - y$. We then retrieve the test case of the current fuzzing seed x that achieves the highest CC value and perturb the test case with one of such pieces of differences, followed by further perturbing the resultant sample to generate a new test case. We repeat the above test case generation procedure with the remaining pieces of differences one after another until the budget for the current fuzzing round exhausts. During this iterative process, we update x ’s test case with the highest CC value if found. Our insight is that, as the fuzzing campaign continues, the seeds that are seed-equivalent to one another at the respective fuzzing rounds gradually capture the fuzzing technique’s most successful relevant experiences to evolve them toward the sharp end (in the sense of generating test cases with high CC values). Moreover, through seed equivalence, we can also explore different “successful” directions when perturbing a seed. As such, we use their corresponding pieces of differences to guide the generation of the test cases of the current fuzzing seed. The above-mentioned test case generation produces test cases in ascending order of CC values for the same seed. Thus, to obtain a test suite containing test cases with higher CC values, developers can assign a longer time budget to allow the generation procedure to generate a larger test pool.

We implement the two main ideas in our fuzzing technique CLOVER and configure the same testing-retraining pipeline adopted by ROBOT [70] to compare CLOVER with peer techniques. The experimental results show the high effectiveness of CLOVER. In terms of the number of generated test cases as well as the number of unique adversarial labels [22, 36, 86] and the number of unique categories [22, 36, 84, 86] of test suites with the same sizes, CLOVER outperforms the peer techniques significantly – (1) on clean models, by 2.5 \times , 2.0 \times , and 3.5 \times compared to ADAPT and 3.6 \times , 1.6 \times , and 1.7 \times compared to ROBOT, respectively, and (2) on adversarially trained models, by 2.1 \times , 3.4 \times , and 4.5 \times compared to ADAPT and 9.2 \times , 9.8 \times , 11.0 \times compared to ROBOT, respectively. Moreover, configuring CLOVER with CC is generally more effective than its two variants configuring with the testing metric (i.e., the Gini index) proposed in DEEPGINI [19] and the first-order loss (FOL) testing metric proposed in ROBOT [15, 70] in terms of the above three measurements. CLOVER also shows a greater potential in improving the robustness property of clean models via the testing-retraining pipeline² than the peer techniques by large extents – (1) our testing metric CC boosts the robustness improvements by 11%–18% atop RANDOM, 40%–45% atop DEEPGINI [19], 17%–39% atop BE-ST [70], and 12%–18% atop KM-ST [70], (2) CLOVER outperforms ADAPT [36] by 67%–129% and ROBOT [70] by 48%–100% in terms of robustness improvement ratio, (3) configuring CLOVER with CC is more effective than its two variants that are configured with the two testing metrics in DEEPGINI and ROBOT, respectively, and (4) configuring CLOVER with the same loss-based metric of ROBOT also outperforms the original ROBOT. We have also included a case study that compares CLOVER with peer techniques on fuzzing adversarially trained models in terms of the ability to generate test cases using the three

²We note that a vast majority of existing works [22, 23, 25, 36, 49, 49, 50, 68, 70, 84, 86] only measure the performance of the fuzzing techniques on clean models.

measurement metrics. The results further consolidate the above finding on clean models that CLOVER generates more diverse robustness-oriented test suites than ADAPT and ROBOT in addition to generating significantly more test cases.

The main contribution of this paper is threefold: (1) It proposes the novel testing metric *Contextual Confidence*. (2) It proposes the novel fuzzing technique CLOVER to improve the robustness property of DL models. CLOVER can be used together with a retraining task to constitute the testing-retraining pipeline for the robustness improvement of DL models via testing. (3) It shows the feasibility and high effectiveness of CLOVER through a comprehensive experiment.

We organize the rest of this paper as follows. Section 2 revisits the preliminaries. Section 3 presents CLOVER. Sections 4 to 8 report an experiment, its results, and data analysis to evaluate CLOVER. We review the closely related work in Section 9 and conclude this work in Section 10.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Deep Neural Networks

A deep learning (DL) model f is a function that takes a sample x from an input domain as input and outputs a **prediction vector** $\vec{f}(x)$, in which the probability of each component c in the vector is denoted by $f_c(x)$ and c is an element in a label set \mathbb{C} . The **prediction label** $f(x)$ is the component with the highest probability, defined as $f(x) = \operatorname{argmax}_c f_c(x)$. We denote the ground truth of x by g_x . A sample x is called *correct* if $f(x) = g_x$, otherwise **failing**.

An adversarial example t [24, 45, 70, 77, 89] is an input sample x added with a minor (such as human-imperceptible) difference, yet the model f predicts it with a different label (i.e., $f(x) \neq f(t)$). We refer to the prediction label of t , denoted as v , as an **adversarial label**, i.e., $v = f(t) = \operatorname{argmax}_c f_c(t)$.

The **accuracy** of f on a dataset D is the proportion of D that f correctly predicts, i.e., $\operatorname{ACC}(f) = |\{x \in D | f(x) = g_x\}| / |D|$. A robustness-oriented dataset is a dataset containing adversarial examples for a DL model [70]. The training, test, or robust accuracy is the accuracy of f on a training, test, or robustness-oriented dataset, respectively. Suppose a model f' is produced by retraining f with adversarial examples. The robust accuracy difference, i.e., $\operatorname{ACC}(f') - \operatorname{ACC}(f)$, on a robustness-oriented dataset is called **robustness improvement**.

The **gradient** $\partial \operatorname{obj} / \partial x$ of a model for an optimization objective obj on a sample x indicates the change direction of x that increases the objective value most quickly [24, 45].

A DL fuzzing technique accepts a seed list X as input and outputs a test suite A , and a test case selection technique accepts a test pool P and outputs a subset $A \subseteq P$. A **testing-retraining pipeline** (pipeline for short) configured with a fuzzing technique or a selection technique as the DL testing technique is to apply the DL technique to produce a test suite A followed by retraining f with A and the original training dataset.

A **robust validation dataset** is a set of perturbed samples aiming at validating the extent of a DL model to be resilient to predicting its samples to adversarial labels [15]. We note that the set of adversarial examples for retraining, the robustness-oriented dataset for measuring the robustness improvement, and the robust validation dataset mentioned in Section 1 refer to three different concepts: The first one is for model retraining; the second one is a test dataset to measure the robustness improvements in the experiments; the third one is a dataset outside the testing-retraining pipeline used to check against the user-specified requirement in the overall workflow [70].

2.2 DL Testing with the Target of Robustness Improvement for Deep Learning Models

2.2.1 Why Selecting Test Cases for Improving the Robustness Property of DL Models? Adversarial examples [24, 45, 70, 77, 89] widely exist in the input domains of DL models. Any DL model f should be quality assured and improved, if

needed, against them prior to deployment. The SE community has shown a strong interest in applying SE techniques to enhance the quality of DL models through quality assurance and improvement. As we have presented in Section 1, many DL testing techniques focus on assisting DL models in mitigating the threat of adversarial examples through improving the robustness property of the DL models via a testing-retraining pipeline [15].

Suppose that the robustness of f has been found to be unsatisfactory when measured through a robust validation dataset. One approach to robustness improvement of f is first to apply a set of seed samples for a DL fuzzing technique to produce a test suite A that contains their perturbed versions. A typical strategy is to strengthen the empirical defense of f against A , such as by retraining f with A and the original training dataset [9, 15, 21, 44, 58, 59, 68, 70], developing a better defender/input validator to guard f against samples demonstrated by A [13, 42, 69, 71], or patching f through a maintenance technique [14, 18, 64, 75]. Among them, model retraining is the normal and most widely practiced option to mitigate the threats of the exposed adversarial examples on the robustness property of f . Retraining f with more adversarial examples will reduce the test accuracy, further imposing a natural limit on the number of adversarial examples contained in A , albeit popular to make a tradeoff to improve the robust accuracy [9, 15, 58, 70]. For instance, in the SE literature, the test accuracies before and after retraining are compared to validate that the robustness improvement is observed and the accuracy-robustness tradeoff is not severe (e.g., controlled within 1% difference in test accuracy [15, 23, 70] or through retraining the model with a test suite whose size is at most 10% of a training dataset [15, 19, 70, 93]). The nature of software testing for DL testing in the testing-retraining pipeline further complicates these constraints on A .

A testing-retraining pipeline configured with a fuzzing technique as the DL testing technique can easily generate many test cases from many different seeds. A larger fuzzing budget will enable the DL testing technique to generate more test cases. At the same time, the size of the subset A is constrained to avoid producing a severe tradeoff between clean accuracy and robust accuracy, and the time budget for the pipeline is often limited. These factors inherently limit such a DL testing technique from exploring the effects of many different test case compositions of A on the tradeoff by trial and error. This is vital to determine and include more representative test cases when constructing the subset A , even for the same seed.

The fundamental research question is:

How do we select more representative test cases in constructing a test suite A for robustness improvement through a testing-retraining pipeline?

2.2.2 Related Methods for Selecting Test Cases and their Limitations. A wide range of testing techniques and testing metrics have been developed in the literature for the purpose of answering the research question posed in the last subsection. In this section, we revisit the representative ones closely related to our proposed technique as our experiment compares our technique with them. We note that a detailed description of these techniques can be found in the appendix of this paper.

Following the terminology used in the DL fuzzing domain, we refer to the input sample to a technique as a **seed** and a perturbed sample output by the technique as a **test case**.

FGSM [24] and PGD [45] are popular attacker techniques. They have frequently been used as the baselines to validate other techniques [15, 19, 70]. They can easily produce many hard adversarial examples [24, 45, 89], which are samples predicted to the adversarial labels with high confidence (e.g., 99.99%). For instance, for the testing-retraining pipeline presented in [15, 70], these attacker techniques are used to generate a combined dataset to compare the robust accuracies of the original models and the respective retrained versions in their experiments.

However, these attacker techniques do not *select more representative* test cases in their generation processes. FGSM merely adds perturbations along the gradients to individual seeds and does *not* discriminate the effects of the resultant (failing) test cases. PGD is a compositional gradient-based variant of FGSM. It incrementally adds a series of perturbations (along the gradients) to a seed without any selection or discrimination of intermediate perturbed sample versions during the construction process.

Unlike the above two techniques, **DEEPGINI** [19] is a representative metric-based technique that does not generate any test cases – It purely selects test cases among the given ones. It computes the Gini index [51] of the prediction vector for each test case. DEEPGINI hypothesizes a test case with a higher Gini score is more likely to be misclassified, thereby ranking test cases in descending order of the Gini score. The top-ranked test cases are selected to construct a test suite. Their experiment [19] shows that such test suites in the testing-retraining pipeline produce higher robust accuracy than those produced by coverage-based techniques [32, 40, 50], showing its test case discrimination effect with respect to the robustness property of DL models. Nonetheless, if the given test cases are already failing, the above hypothesis becomes inapplicable, making the selection of the representative ones among the given failing test cases unclear in concept. Our experimental results in Section 5 also could not find the evidence to support test suites containing failing test cases with higher Gini scores producing larger robustness improvement than randomly constructed test suites from the same test pool through a testing-retraining pipeline. It indicates that the technique may not effectively discriminate failing test cases yet.

A popular approach to introducing the discrimination effect in test case generation is incrementally adding a series of *selective* perturbations to a seed. To our knowledge, many fuzzing techniques for fuzzing DL models fall into this category. For instance, a coverage-based fuzzing technique [25, 36] often adds one or more perturbations to each intermediate version of a test case to produce one or more candidates for the next version and selects the candidate covering more not-yet-covered coverage items (e.g., more uncovered neurons) [32, 40, 50] as the next intermediate version of the test case. In essence, these techniques consider test cases of the same seed covering more coverage items of a coverage criterion more representative. Nonetheless, as presented in the literature [27, 38, 85], the test suites thus produced by these coverage-based techniques are not obviously correlated with the exposure of failures or the robustness of DL models. The results in the literature indicate that the metrics to guide the generation of test cases and the metrics for test case selection should be carefully designed to be effective.

ROBOT [15, 70] is a state-of-the-art loss-based fuzzing technique. It incrementally generates intermediate test cases per seed with an increasingly larger loss distance. Such a loss distance is measured by the first-order loss (FOL) [70], computed as the Euclidean norm [29] of the difference between an intermediate test case and its corresponding seed, where a smaller FOL value represents a smaller distance. All intermediate test cases that are failing are output as test cases for selection. Like PGD, ROBOT adds a perturbation along the corresponding gradient of a sample (seed or not) to that sample to produce such an intermediate test case. The ROBOT algorithm further includes an optimization to terminate the fuzzing round on each seed earlier: It limits the number of trials to generate test cases per seed to a small value (i.e., either at most three trials or the change in FOL value between the latest two intermediate test cases smaller than a small value 10^{-18} in their experiment) to cut off the long tail of the potential intermediate test cases for each seed. This poses two limitations: First, suppose that the series of intermediate test cases converge their FOL values quickly and yet the prediction labels for these intermediate test cases may remain the same as that of the original seed. In this case, the technique can hardly generate adversarial examples from the seed. Second, suppose that the series of intermediate test cases converge their FOL values slowly. Plenty of intermediate test cases will be added to the seed list with the priority for further fuzzing before exploiting the next original seed, leading to the low-efficiency problem in

processing the seeds in the original seed list. In our experiment, we observe that if a model under fuzzing is a model after adversarial training, ROBOT significantly loses its ability to generate test cases.

Besides discriminating the intermediate test cases, like DEEPGINI, ROBOT has its own test case selection strategies: BE-ST and KM-ST. ROBOT sorts the generated test cases in descending order of first-order loss into a sorted test pool P . To construct a test suite A containing n test cases, its BE-ST strategy selects the top- $n/2$ and bottom- $n/2$ test cases from P . On the other hand, its KM-ST strategy equally divides P into k sublists and randomly picks n/k samples from every sublist to construct the test suite A . KM-ST is generally better than BE-ST in our experiment.

Although ROBOT generates test cases with larger losses (measured in FOL) per seed, to construct the final test suite A , it selects test cases with diverse loss distances (e.g., the largest and smallest few if using BE-ST or the random few from different sublists if using KM-ST). ROBOT has no clear (loss-based) direction between the test cases in A and the test cases of the same seed it generates. Thus, test cases in A may be difficult for developers to interpret when compared with those in P .

ROBOT is later generalized into the QUOTE framework [15] to make the testing-retraining pipeline clear for the purpose of robustness or fairness improvement. In their experiment, they apply the FOL metric to select test cases generated by existing techniques to show that FOL has a better effect on selecting more valuable test cases to improve the model’s robustness. The experiment also shows that FOL-guided fuzzing has a better guidance effect in test case generation than existing techniques with respect to improving the model’s robustness.

ADAPT [36] is a state-of-the-art coverage-based technique. It uses a genetic algorithm approach to explore a neuron-based coverage space. A chromosome is a sequence of real numbers, one for a measurement metric. ADAPT designs a long list of such measurement metrics to measure a neuron against a chromosome (e.g., two metrics are whether the activation value of a neuron under measure is in top 10%–20% and top 40%–50% in the same forward pass of f , respectively). It first populates a set R of random chromosomes per seed. Let $x^{(i)}$ be the working sample in the i^{th} iteration to generate an intermediate test case for a given seed x where $x^{(0)} = x$. For each chromosome $p \in R$, ADAPT computes a score as the dot product of p and the feature vector of each neuron when predicting the label of $x^{(i)}$. It then selects the top- m (where $m = 10$ in their experiment) neurons with the highest score and perturbs $x^{(i)}$ into $x^{(i+1)}$ against the loss of these m neurons. If $x^{(i+1)}$ covers not-yet-covered elements (e.g., the set of activated neurons is not covered by previous test cases with respect to the adopted neuron coverage metric) and is within the fuzzing boundary, it will be kept in the fuzzing list as a candidate seed for further fuzzing process. ADAPT measures the coverage, such as the neuron coverage [50], achieved by $x^{(i+1)}$. After having processed all the chromosomes for the working sample, it reduces the chromosome set R to a minimal subset S that retains the same coverage as R followed by expanding S by adding these chromosomes in R that cover most coverage items until a threshold on the size of S is met. ADAPT then iteratively crossovers two randomly-picked chromosomes in S followed by adding Gaussian noise to construct a new chromosome and place this new chromosome into S until $|S| = |R|$. The resultant S is assigned to R , and the sample $x^{(i+1)}$ that covers new coverage items becomes the working sample. The iteration to process R repeats until the candidate seed list is empty or the fuzzing budget is exhausted.

It is unclear how to determine which test cases of the same seed are more representative in ADAPT. This is because the retained test cases across different iterations are not measured against the same baseline (e.g., the set of m neurons used in the optimization objective varies across iterations). The list of measurement metrics is also specifically designed to make no test case able to obtain non-zero scores from the same kind of metrics simultaneously (e.g., the activation value of a neuron in the same pass cannot be located in two non-overlapping ranges of activation values simultaneously).

2.3 Model Retraining in the Testing-Retraining Pipeline

In the traditional program testing domain, after the testing of a program has exposed bugs in the program, the correctness of the program is improved by repairing the exposed bugs, which produces a repaired version of the program. The test cases that expose the bugs and those that the original program can pass are used to retest the repaired program. Developers usually expect that the repaired program should not only pass all these test cases but also be revised so that other inputs do not trigger the same fixed bugs.

In the DL model domain, as presented in Section 1, after obtaining the test cases that expose the vulnerability of a DL model, the procedure to obtain and validate an improved version can be different. Suppose a purpose is to improve a DL model’s robustness by correcting the DL model’s wrong predictions exposed by a test suite A generated by a DL testing technique. In that case, model retraining [15, 19, 22, 23, 25, 32, 44, 50, 68, 70, 86] is a typical means to achieve it. In a typical retraining procedure for this purpose, these test cases in A are added to the original training dataset to retrain the DL model while keeping all other training settings, such as hyperparameters, unchanged [15].

Nonetheless, unlike repairing a traditional program, retraining a DL model makes the retrained model memorize the training samples and their labels (so-called the memorization effect [10, 26]). Thus, although the retrained model may “recall from the memory” to pass all these test cases of A in the retesting procedure, it only presents a false sense of robustness to developers.

Therefore, the retrained model should be retested with some other samples that the model under test fails to predict correctly and the retraining task in the pipeline does not use them for retraining the model simultaneously. Since the productions of the model under test and the retrained model mainly differ in whether the test cases in the test suite A are used as additional training samples in the training/retraining task, the difference in robust accuracy before and after the retraining task shows the impact of the test suite on mitigating the threat of robustness on the DL model under test, and, consequently, implies the robustness-oriented value of the DL testing technique that constructs the test suite.

2.4 Testing-Retraining Pipeline for Testing DL Models for Robustness Improvement

ROBOT [70] presents an **assessment methodology (AM)** to support the testing-retraining pipeline for improving the robustness property of a DL model under test f . The key distinction of this pipeline from the classical testing pipelines in the DL testing literature is that it incorporates the retraining task [15, 70]. Different from the pipeline of pure adversarial retraining [21, 59], the testing-retraining pipeline in AM includes a testing step to generate test suites guided by a testing metric. Similar methodologies are also used in the experiments of other related works [15, 19, 43, 93], albeit proposed independently.

The workflow of AM is as follows. Users first provide a robust validation dataset D_{ass} and a user-specified requirement r on the model robustness (e.g., 80% of the samples (adversarial examples) in the robust validation dataset can be predicted correctly [15]). For instance, in [70], D_{ass} is composed of the adversarial examples generated by two attacker techniques, i.e., FGSM [24] and PGD [45], on f . The workflow then invokes a testing-retraining pipeline. The pipeline first calls a metric-oriented DL testing technique to generate a test suite (where the generation process is guided by the testing metric of the technique) or a test case selection technique guided by a testing metric to select test cases from a given test pool provided by the user to construct a test suite. In either case, it then calls a retraining task to retrain the current DL model under test with the constructed test suite and the original training dataset. The workflow then validates whether the accuracy of the resulting model on D_{ass} satisfies r . If this is the case, the workflow outputs the resulting model and terminates the whole process.

AM also implicitly requires that the clean accuracy is not severely compromised. For instance, in their experiment [15, 70], the difference in the test accuracies before and after the testing-retraining pipeline is controlled to be within 1%, or the fuzzing time budget is limited to a short period, such as 5–20 minutes, so that a fuzzing technique can only generate a relatively limited number of test cases (e.g., 4023 test cases on ResNet20 trained on CIFAR10 [15]) compared to the training dataset (50000 samples for CIFAR10) so that the technique can apply all generated test cases for the retraining task to improve the model robustness.

In essence, the same testing-retraining pipeline configured with different DL testing techniques can be compared in two aspects. The first aspect is to select test cases from the same given test pool P using the testing metric and its associated test case prioritization technique of such a DL testing technique to prioritize P before the selection. The second aspect is to apply a DL fuzzing technique to generate a test pool P followed by selecting a subset of P to construct a test suite based on the test case prioritization/selection technique of such a DL testing technique. We refer to these two aspects as Configurations A and B of the pipeline, respectively. In either configuration, CLOVER prioritizes P via the ContextSelect strategy (see Algorithm 4), and the peer techniques prioritize P according to the respective selection strategy (e.g., BE-ST and KM-ST of ROBOT) or prioritization technique (e.g., DEEPGINI).

It should be worth noting that replacing the testing-retraining pipeline with pure adversarial retraining can also improve the robustness of f against adversarial examples. With this alternative pipeline (which consists of a single task), a fuzzing technique in the resulting workflow can be used as a test case generation technique to assure the robustness quality of the adversarially trained model.

2.5 Auxiliary functions

To aid our presentation, we define the following three auxiliary functions for a fuzzing technique that takes a set of seeds X as input and fuzzes on a sequence Z , the occurrences of these seeds.

- The function **SEMANTIC**(s) returns the ground truth label of a sample s if applicable. Otherwise, it returns the prediction label $f(s)$ of s . We refer to the returned label as the **seed label** of s .
- The function **ISADVERSARIAL**(s, t) is a Boolean function accepting a seed s and a test case t generated from s . It returns true if the seed label of s is different from the prediction label of t (i.e., $\text{SEMANTIC}(s) \neq f(t)$); otherwise, it returns false.
- The function **SOURCE**(z) returns the seed $x \in X$ for its occurrence z in Z , i.e., $\text{SOURCE}(z) = x$ satisfying the condition $x \in X \wedge z = x$. It is the mapping between the elements in Z and X .

Since Z contains the occurrences of the seeds in X , we assume that each element in Z and its corresponding element in X have the same seed label (i.e., $\forall z \in Z, \exists x \in X, \text{SOURCE}(z) = x \wedge \text{SEMANTIC}(z) = \text{SEMANTIC}(x)$).

3 CLOVER

In this section, we present CLOVER. As we have presented in Section 1, the scope of CLOVER is to be applied as a DL testing technique in the testing-retraining pipeline. For brevity, we simply refer to the robustness improvement achieved by a retrained model output by the testing-retraining pipeline configured with CLOVER to be the DL testing technique as the robustness improvement achieved by CLOVER delivered through the pipeline.

3.1 Intuition

Let X be a set of seeds and P be a test suite generated from X to test a model f . Each such test case in P is within the ϵ -ball of its corresponding seed measured in a p -norm distance. Let t and t' in P be two test cases perturbed from the same seed x (denoted by $t \approx t'$). Suppose further t' is in δ -ball of t (i.e., $\|t - t'\|_p < \delta$) where $\delta \ll \epsilon$.

Suppose we find a subset $A \subset P$ such that A simulates P in the sense that each sample t' in the set $P - A$ is in the δ -ball of the same sample t in A , and the prediction vectors $\vec{f}(t)$ and $\vec{f}(t')$ are similar. Intuitively, thanks to the linearity of the activation functions in f , (re)training f with t has a better chance to generalize f around t to make the (re)trained model correctly infer t' rather than some other test cases with their prediction outputs differing much.

Thus, given the same fuzzing budget $|P|$, by taking t but not t' into A , a fuzzing technique can allocate the remaining budget quota $|P| - |A|$ to generate and select other test cases that are not in P . In practice, we cannot analytically and efficiently determine the simulation relation between P and A due to the statistical nature of deep learning models and the large size of $|P|$. We thus look for an efficient and downscaled approximation of the relation.

Our basic idea is to generate $t \in A$ with the samples that surround it resembling t in high chance and includes t (without its surrounding samples) in the constructing test suite A . In other words, we aim to study the representativeness of a test case through the perturbation sets closely surrounding the former test cases and study how to generate more representative test cases.

3.2 Measuring the Representativeness of Test Cases

In fuzzing, adding a perturbation, denoted by Ω , to a test case t generates a new sample (denoted by $t + \Omega$) within the p -norm bound δ (i.e., $\|t - (t + \Omega)\|_p < \delta$). Moreover, as fuzzing is computationally expensive, we aim to measure the representativeness of test cases efficiently. CLOVER chooses the uniform noise as the type of perturbation because we are inspired by the $sign(\cdot)$ function used in many techniques (e.g., [24, 54]) to perturb samples in a black box manner (e.g., without computing the gradients) efficiently. Such noises are fair to all test cases so that a comparison between test cases can be more objective. Suppose we have a test case t and a sample $y \in \delta$ -ball of t where $\Omega = y - t$. We refer to Ω as a contextual perturbation of t . Since enumerating all contextual perturbations of t is intractable, CLOVER samples a set of k contextual perturbations, denoted by $ctx^k(t)$.

We propose the metric **contextual confidence**, CC for short, to measure the representativeness of a test case. CC measures the degree of consensus among the surrounding samples of a test case. It has four parameters (f, t, v, k) : a model f , a test case t , the adversarial label v of t , and the cardinality of $ctx^k(t)$. We note that CC is not a test adequacy criterion as it does not formulate the requirement of a coverage item. It computes the mean of the set $\{Pr_v(\vec{f}(t + \Omega)) \mid \Omega \in ctx^k(t)\}$, where $Pr_v(\vec{f}(t + \Omega))$ is the probability value of the label v in the prediction vector $\vec{f}(t + \Omega)$. We use the shorthand notation $CC(t)$ instead of the full notation $CC(f, t, v, k)$, and Eq. (1) presents its formula.

$$CC(t) = \frac{\sum_{\Omega \in ctx^k(t)} Pr_v(\vec{f}(t + \Omega))}{|ctx^k(t)|} \quad (1)$$

3.3 Conceptual Fuzzing Model of CLOVER

3.3.1 Overview. Like FGSM, CLOVER does not impose additional requirements on the optimization objective, denoted by obj , and uses the same objective function as FGSM when computing the gradients. It accepts a set of seeds X as input and generates test cases from the seed occurrence sequence $Z \in X^*$ (where X^* is the Kleene closure of X).




Fig. 2. Relationship between the Seed z_i in Z and its Test Cases and α -Representative Test Case

The conceptual model of CLOVER includes five main steps: CLOVER tracks the test case with the highest CC value among the test cases generated for each seed occurrence, which is referred to as the α -representative test case of the seed occurrence (see Section 3.3.2). In each fuzzing round on an occurrence of a seed, it retrieves the seed label of the seed and the prediction label of a test case of the seed, where this test case is the one that achieves the highest CC value among all generated α -representative test cases of all seed occurrences of that seed. (We refer to these two labels as the label pair of the seed at the fuzzing round.) It finds the piece of difference between the seed and this test case, referred to as the β -AFO for the seed at the fuzzing round (see Section 3.3.3).

On fuzzing the DL model with z (a seed occurrence of seed x) as the input seed at a fuzzing round, it determines the set of seeds that contains these seeds sharing the same label pair with x (referred to as seed equivalence among these seeds in Section 3.3.4). It generates a test case for z using the collected perturbation information, including the current β -AFO of x and the β -AFO of a seed in this set of seeds, and generates more such test cases for z if the fuzzing budget for z allows (see Section 3.3.5). Finally, CLOVER constructs a test suite (see Section 3.3.6).

We note that α -representative test case is a notional concept to ease our presentation of two other main concepts (β -adversarial front object and seed equivalence) in CLOVER.

The next five subsections present these steps. For brevity, we **overload the term “seed”** as the terminology to refer to the term “seed occurrence” in Z to condense the presentation. Moreover, unless stated otherwise, a seed refers to a seed occurrence in Z .

3.3.2 Track representative test case. Like other fuzzing techniques, CLOVER aims to generate a set of test cases, denoted by $Q(z_i)$, for each given seed $z_i \in Z$ (where $z_i = Z[i]$ for all i). We refer to the test case with the highest CC value among the test cases in $Q(z_i)$ as the **α -representative test case** for z_i , denoted as \bar{z}_i . (We use the symbol \perp to stand for the bottom element, which indicates all applied fuzzing attempts on z_i are unsuccessful, and no test case is generated from z_i yet. As such, we choose $-\infty$ as its CC value.)

$$\bar{z}_i = \begin{cases} t' = \operatorname{argmax}_t \{CC(t) \mid t \in Q(z_i) \wedge \text{ISADVERSARIAL}(z_i, t) = \text{true}\} & \text{if } Q(z_i) \neq \emptyset \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Fig. 2 depicts that t_i^1 , t_i^2 , and t_i^3 are three test cases of the seed (occurrence) z_i . Their CC values are 0.6, 0.8, and 0.7, respectively. The test case t_i^2 is depicted as the α -representative test case of z_i , i.e., \bar{z}_i , because its CC value is highest among the test cases of z_i . The diagram also shows that t_i^2 has an adversarial label of 3. Fig. 3 depicts the relationships between the seeds in Z and X where the three seed occurrences z_i , z_j , and z_k map to the same seed $b \in X$ through the function $\text{SOURCE}(\cdot)$.




Fig. 3. Relationship among Seeds in Z, Seeds in X, and α -Representative Test Cases

3.3.3 *Track the representative adversarial front object.* After knowing \bar{z}_i for the seed z_i , we can compute their difference (i.e., $\bar{z}_i - z_i$), which captures the overall change that leads z_i to become its α -representative test case. We refer to this piece of difference as the **α -adversarial front object (α -AFO)** for z_i .

As such, we annotate the α -AFO for z_i with three indexes (i, u, v) , denoted as $\Delta_i^{(u,v)}$, where i is the index of the seed z_i in Z (as the seed under test in the i^{th} fuzzing round), i.e., $z_i = Z[i]$, u is the seed label returned by $\text{SEMANTIC}(z_i)$, and v is the adversarial label $f(\bar{z}_i)$. Accordingly, the matching sequence of α -AFOs for the seed sequence Z , denoted as Π , is defined below.

$$\Pi = \langle \Delta_i^{(u,v)} \mid z_i = Z[i] \wedge u = \text{SEMANTIC}(z_i) \wedge v = f(\bar{z}_i) \wedge \Delta_i^{(u,v)} = \bar{z}_i - z_i \rangle_{i=0}^{|Z|-1}$$

A seed in X may have several occurrences in Z . We thus raise the level of adversarial front objects from the seed occurrence level (the level for Z) to the seed level (the level for X). CLOVER tracks the **β -representative adversarial front object** for each seed x in X (**β -AFO** for short) at each fuzzing round, where Eq. (2) summarizes how to find the β -AFO, denoted as ${}_x\Delta_i^{(u,v)}$, for a seed $x \in X$ at the i^{th} fuzzing round.³ Specifically, Eq. (2) retrieves the α -AFO among these in Π that are produced in all fuzzing rounds up to and including the i^{th} fuzzing round and share the same seed as x such that x added with the retrieved α -AFO achieves the highest CC value among these test cases formed by individually adding these α -AFOs to x . Moreover, we define the helper function $\phi(x, i)$ to return the β -AFO of x at the i^{th} fuzzing round.

$${}_x\Delta_i^{(u,v)} = \phi(x, i) = \underset{\Delta_j^{(u,v)} \in \Gamma(x, i)}{\text{argmax}} \quad \text{CC}(x + \Delta_j^{(u,v)}) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{such that } \Gamma(x, i) = \{ \Delta_j^{(u,v)} \mid 0 \leq j \leq i \wedge \Delta_j^{(u,v)} = \Pi[j] \wedge z_j = Z[j] \wedge x = \text{SOURCE}(z_j) \}$$

We note that we use the two similar notations ${}_x\Delta_i^{(u,v)}$ and $\Delta_i^{(u,v)}$ to refer to the adversarial front objects for the seed x in X and the seed occurrence of z_i in Z , respectively, where z_i is a seed occurrence of x at the i^{th} fuzzing round.

We refer to the set $\{\phi(x, i)\}_{x \in X}$ as the *adversarial front* at the $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$ fuzzing round. Intuitively, it captures the best configuration to make X adversarial and attain the highest possible CC values.

³If the set $\Gamma(x, i)$ in Eq. (2) is empty (i.e., x has not generated any test cases), we set ${}_x\Delta_i^{(u,v)}$ to zero, and we denote the adversarial label of this special case by the label a_{\perp} , i.e., the retrieved β -AFO for x by Eq. (2) is ${}_x\Delta_i^{(\text{SEMANTIC}(x), a_{\perp})}$, and its value is 0.




Fig. 4. Relationship between α -AFO and β -AFO at the $(i+1)^{th}$ Fuzzing Round

Fig. 4 depicts the relationships between α -AFOs of an exemplified seed occurrence sequence Z and β -AFOs of an exemplified seed list X at the $(i+1)^{th}$ fuzzing round. X contains four seeds $\{a, b, c, d\}$ and Z contains eight seeds from z_1 to z_8 . The α -representative test cases of the seeds in Z , denoted as \bar{z}_1 to \bar{z}_8 , and their CC values are depicted in the third row. For simplicity, if the ground truth label of a seed in Z is 1, then the adversarial label of its α -representative test case is 2, and vice versa. The corresponding α -AFOs of z_1 to z_8 (i.e., the pieces of differences are $\bar{z}_i - z_i$ for $i = 1$ to 8) are shown in the fourth row. Finally, the β -AFOs for the seeds in X are shown in the last row. Take the β -AFO for the seed a as an example. There are two α -AFOs ($\bar{z}_1 - a$ and $\bar{z}_5 - a$) generated from the seed occurrences of this seed. The CC value of the α -representative test case for z_5 is higher than that of z_1 . So, the β -AFO ${}_a\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$ is computed as $\bar{z}_5 - a$. The β -AFOs for the other three seeds in X are computed in the same manner. The set of β -AFOs in the last row in Fig. 4 also depicts an adversarial front. Intuitively, as the fuzzing campaign continues, the adversarial front moves toward the end of higher contextual confidence.

3.3.4 Find seed equivalence and equivalence class. We further raise the above concept of adversarial front objects at the i^{th} fuzzing round from the seed level to the seed equivalence level. Intuitively, these adversarial front objects associated with the equivalent seeds in X capture the most successful discovery of the fuzzing technique to produce test cases with the highest CC values for label pairs.

Definition 3.1 (Seed Equivalence and Equivalence Class of Seeds). Suppose x and x' are two seeds in X having ${}_x\Delta_i^{(u,v)}$ and ${}_{x'}\Delta_i^{(u',v')}$ as their β -AFOs at the i^{th} fuzzing round, respectively. We call x and x' seed-equivalent at the i^{th} fuzzing round, denoted by $x \sim_i x'$, if and only if $u = u'$ and $v = v'$. The equivalence class for the seed x at the i^{th} fuzzing round is defined as $[x]_i = \{x' \in X \mid x \sim_i x'\}$.

Recall that the behavior of a DL model for a class (i.e., a label in \mathbb{C}) is generalized from a set of samples for that class. Definition 3.1 presents the notions of seed equivalence and the equivalence class of seeds. In short, to quantify a seed $x \in X$ to be seed-equivalent to other seeds at the i^{th} fuzzing round, we look for semantic (seed label) equivalence among these seeds and the adversarial label equivalence — Those seeds in the same equivalence class are predicted by




Fig. 5. Equivalence Classes at the $(i + 1)^{th}$ Fuzzing Round.

the DL model under test to the same adversarial label end after perturbation from the same seed label end. Moreover, moving from one end to another end for a seed is exactly captured by the β -AFO of the seed.

Fig. 5 depicts how equivalent classes look like for the scenario shown in Fig. 4. By grouping these seeds by their pairs of seed labels and adversarial labels, the two pairs of seeds (a, c) and (b, d) are grouped into two different equivalence classes.

Thus, based on seed equivalence, we exploit the β -AFOs of the seeds in the same equivalence class to assist the generation of test cases for individual seeds in the corresponding equivalence classes at respective fuzzing rounds. To aid our presentation, we denote the set of β -AFOs for the seeds in the equivalence class $[x]_i$ that excludes the one for x by $AC(x, i) = \{\phi(x', i) \mid x' \neq x \wedge x' \in [x]_i\}$.

The next section presents our idea to generate test cases and track the β -AFOs for their seeds.


3.3.5 Generate β -AFO and test cases for the current seed under fuzzing. In this section, we use the concepts presented in the last two subsections to illustrate how to generate test cases for a seed. We present the main principle below and leave the details to the next section when we present the *ContextTranslate* algorithm.

Suppose the sample z_{i+1} is the fuzzing seed at the $(i+1)^{th}$ fuzzing round (i.e., $z_{i+1} = Z[i + 1]$). We denote the seed for this seed occurrence z_{i+1} by x'' ($= \text{SOURCE}(z_{i+1})$).

In the $(i+1)^{th}$ fuzzing round, to make use of information captured in the set $\cup_{x \in X} AC(x, i)$, our idea is to add one of these closely relevant β -AFOs (modeled as these β -AFOs in the set $AC(x'', i)$) as a perturbation to the current test case of z_{i+1} (i.e., the test case corresponding to the current β -AFO for the seed x'') to produce the next test case candidate in each iteration, thereby generating a sequence of test case candidates (denoted by T here) iteratively.⁴

Nonetheless, not every such test case candidate could be useful. So, during the generation of T , if a test case candidate $t \in T$ is adversarial (i.e., $\text{ISADVERSARIAL}(z_{i+1}, t)$ returns true), it will be placed into the set of generated test cases $Q(z_{i+1})$ for z_{i+1} . Moreover, there are two cases to consider. Suppose the current iteration to process T is w and the current test case candidate $T[w]$. *Case (1)*: Suppose $T[w]$ achieves a higher CC value than the existing test cases of the seed x'' . In this case, the β -AFO for x'' is updated to $T[w] - z_{i+1}$ before proceeding to the next iteration. This test case will be used in the addition process in the next iteration. *Case (2)*: On the other hand, suppose $T[w]$ cannot achieve a higher CC value than the existing test cases of the seed x'' . We will discard the candidate $T[w]$ from the sequence T and continue the addition process in the next iteration based on the preceding test case candidate in T that is not discarded (i.e., the latest test case that is found in *Case (1)* above).

⁴We leave the presentation of the other details of the addition process to Section 3.4.



Note: (1) $X = \{a, b, c, d, e, f, \dots\}$. (2) $SOURCE(z_{i+1}) = a$. (3) $\Delta_{\beta-AFO}$ is initialized as β -AFO of a (i.e., $a\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$).

Fig. 6. Incremental Generation of Test Cases of Seed z_{i+1} ($= Z[i + 1]$) using the Set of β -AFOs $AC(a, i)$ of These Seeds in the Equivalence Class $[a]_i$ where $a = SOURCE(z_{i+1})$.

Like other typical fuzzing techniques [15, 36, 70], CLOVER assigns a test budget to each seed to control the number of fuzzing attempts applicable to the seed, which is modeled as the length of the sequence of β -AFOs applied to generate the sequence T .

We use the following example to illustrate the test case generation process.

Fig. 6 depicts how CLOVER evolves β -AFOs for the seed a in the following set X , and generates test cases in the same fuzzing round. Suppose we are in the $(i + 1)^{th}$ fuzzing round, in which the current seed occurrence under fuzzing is z_{i+1} , which is an occurrence of the seed a in the set $X = \{a, b, c, d, e, f, \dots\}$. Suppose further the β -AFO for the seed a at the i^{th} fuzzing round is $a\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$, and the seeds $\{b, c, d, e, f, \dots\}$ are in the equivalence class $[a]_i$. Let $\Delta_{\beta-AFO}$ be a variable, which is initialized to $a\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$. Let us focus on the evolution of the β -AFO for the seed a as well as the generation of test cases for the current seed occurrence z_{i+1} . CLOVER firstly constructs the set $AC(a, i)$, which contains the β -AFOs for the seeds in $[a]_i$. In the first attempt, it initializes a working sample $z_{i+1} + \Delta'_{\beta-AFO}$ as $z_{i+1} + \frac{\partial obj}{\partial z_{i+1}} + \Delta_{\beta-AFO}$, where the idea is to slightly perturb the current α -representative test case of z_{i+1} (i.e., $z_{i+1} + \Delta_{\beta-AFO}$) along the gradient of z_{i+1} to produce this working sample (see Alg. 3 for the details). After attempting to add the first β -AFO (i.e., depicted as $b\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$ in the figure) taken from $AC(a, i)$ to the working sample and then evolve it into a resulting test case candidate t_{i+1}^1 , CLOVER detects t_{i+1}^1 having a higher CC value than all existing test cases of the seed a (also see Alg. 3 for the details). (We note that in the above evolution step, the idea is to perturb the sample along the gradient, which is inspired by an observed common phenomenon of many existing attacker techniques: they often generate test cases with very high prediction confidence (close to 1).) Thus, CLOVER updates $\Delta_{\beta-AFO}$ to the piece of difference represented by $t_{i+1}^1 - z_{i+1}$ (i.e., assign $t_{i+1}^1 - z_{i+1}$ to the variable $\Delta_{\beta-AFO}$) and keeps t_{i+1}^1 in the test set $Q(z_{i+1})$ since t_{i+1}^1 is adversarial. In the second attempt, it repeats the process of the first attempt (but adds with another β -AFO taken

Seeds X with ground truth	$(a, 1), (b, 2), (c, 1), (d, 2), \dots$					
Seed occurrences Z	$(a, 1), (b, 2), (c, 1), (d, 2), (a, 1), (b, 2), (c, 1), (d, 2), \dots$ $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, z_5, z_6, z_7, z_8, \dots$					
Test cases of a with their CC values	$(t_5^2, 0.95)$	$(t_5^1, 0.90)$	$(t_1^2, 0.85)$	$(t_1^1, 0.70)$	$(t_1^3, 0.70)$	
Test cases of b with their CC values	$(t_2^2, 0.90)$	$(t_6^4, 0.85)$	$(t_6^2, 0.83)$	$(t_2^1, 0.70)$	$(t_6^1, 0.60)$	$(t_6^3, 0.60)$
Test cases of c with their CC values	$(t_7^3, 0.82)$	$(t_3^1, 0.80)$	$(t_7^2, 0.80)$	$(t_7^1, 0.75)$		
Test cases of d with their CC values	$(t_8^2, 0.97)$	$(t_8^1, 0.93)$	$(t_8^3, 0.88)$	$(t_4^3, 0.75)$	$(t_4^1, 0.70)$	$(t_4^2, 0.70)$
Layers	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_4	L_5	L_6

Fig. 7. Layering Test Cases with Their CC Values for Test Case Selection.

from $AC(a, i)$ instead of $b\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$) and produces the test case candidate t_{i+1}^2 . It updates the variable $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ to the piece of difference represented by $t_{i+1}^2 - z_{i+1}$ and keeps t_{i+1}^2 in the test set $Q(z_{i+1})$ for the same reason as the first attempt above. Similarly, in the third attempt, CLOVER generates the test case candidate t_{i+1}^3 and detects it being adversarial but not with a higher CC value than the existing test cases of a . Thus, it only keeps t_{i+1}^3 in the test set $Q(z_{i+1})$ without updating $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$. Therefore, the fourth attempt continues based on the results of the second attempt. It detects the generated test case candidate t_{i+1}^4 in that attempt not having a higher CC value and not adversarial. Thus, it neither updates $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ nor keeps t_{i+1}^4 . Similarly, the fifth attempt also continues from the second attempt.

We note that the membership of an equivalence class $[\text{SOURCE}(z_{j+1})]_j$ depends on the latest adversarial label and the highest CC value among the test cases of the seed, which may vary as the index j varies. Thus, two seeds x and x' in X may belong to the same equivalence class for some j but different equivalence classes for some other j . This achieves an adaptive partitioning scheme on X while processing Z over different fuzzing rounds.

3.3.6 Construct a test suite for robustness improvement. After fuzzing the sequence Z , CLOVER selects test cases among groups of test cases, one group per seed in X , as even as possible at the seed (of X) level and with a preference for selecting test cases with higher CC values. After constructing the test suite, the testing-retraining pipeline that is configured with CLOVER retrains the DL model under test.

Fig. 7 depicts how CLOVER selects the test cases into the constructing test suite A in concept. It illustrates that test cases are reordered in the style of layering (i.e., depicted as layers L_i for $1 \leq i \leq 6$) in the descending order of the CC values of the test cases, and CLOVER selects test cases layer by layer. Suppose the required size of a test suite is 10. In this case, all eight test cases in layers L_1 and L_2 are selected. The remaining two test cases are selected from L_3 with the descending order of CC values. Thus, the two test cases t_8^3 and t_1^2 are selected.

3.4 Algorithms

This section presents the detailed algorithms of CLOVER.

Algorithm 1: CLOVER: Context-Aware Robustness Fuzzing

```

Input :  $f \leftarrow$  model under test
          $X \leftarrow$  seeds
          $m \leftarrow$  average number of fuzzing attempts for a seed
          $n \leftarrow$  size of test suite

Output: test suite  $A$ 
1  $P = \text{ContextFuzz}(f, X, m, \text{ContextTranslate})$  ▷ generate test cases
2  $A = \text{ContextSelect}(P, n)$  ▷ construct a test suite
3 return  $A$ 

```

Algorithm 2: ContextFuzz: Seed-Equivalent Sequence-to-Sequence Fuzzing

```

Input :  $f \leftarrow$  model under test
          $X \leftarrow$  seeds
          $m \leftarrow$  average number of fuzzing attempts per seed
         ContextTranslator  $\leftarrow$  seed-equivalent sequence-to-sequence translator

Output: test cases  $P$ 
1  $P = \emptyset, \mathcal{F} = \emptyset, \mathcal{I} = \emptyset, i = 0$  ▷  $\mathcal{F}$  is the adversarial front
2 for  $x \in X$  do
3    $\mathcal{F}(x) = \mathbf{0}, \mathcal{I}(x) = 1$ 
4    $x' = x + \text{PROCESSING}(x, \partial \text{obj} / \partial x)$ 
5    $f.\text{predict}(x')$ 
6   if ISADVERSARIAL( $x, x'$ ) then
7      $P(x).\text{add}(x', \text{CC}(x'))$ 
8      $\mathcal{F}(x) = \partial \text{obj} / \partial x$  ▷ initialize a  $\beta$ -AFO for the seed
9      $\mathcal{I}(x) = \mathcal{I}(x) + 1$ 
10  end if
11 end for
12 while budget is not exhausted do
13   if  $i = 0$  then
14      $\text{energy} = \langle \lceil \frac{m\mathcal{I}(x)}{\sum_{x \in X} \mathcal{I}(x) / |X|} \rceil \rangle_{x \in X}$  ▷ compute the energy for every seed
15   end if
16    $x_i = X[i]$ 
17    $AC(x_i) = \langle \mathcal{F}(x') \rangle_{x' \in [x_i] - \{x_i\}}$  such that  $|AC(x_i)| = \min(\text{energy}[i], |x_i| - 1)$ 
18    $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}, Q(x_i), \#evolved = \text{ContextTranslate}(f, x_i, AC(x_i), \mathcal{F}(x_i), \partial \text{obj} / \partial x_i, \text{CC}_{\max}(P(x_i)))$ 
19    $\mathcal{F}(x_i) = \Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$  ▷ maintain the  $\beta$ -AFO of the seed
20    $P(x_i) = P(x_i) \cup Q(x_i)$  ▷ keep the test cases
21    $\mathcal{I}(x_i) = \mathcal{I}(x_i) + \#evolved$ 
22    $i = (i + 1) \bmod |X|$ 
23 end while
24 return  $P$ 

```

3.4.1 *The CLOVER Algorithm.* Algorithm 1 presents the overall algorithm of CLOVER. It accepts four parameters: f is the model under test, X is a set of given seeds, m is the average number of fuzzing attempts per seed, and n is the size of the test suite to be constructed. It generates a test suite P via Algorithms 2 and 3, and returns a subset A of P with n test cases via Algorithm 4.

3.4.2 The ContextFuzz Algorithm. Algorithm 2 presents the *ContextFuzz* algorithm. It accepts four inputs: f is the model under test, X is the seeds, m is the mean number of fuzzing attempts per seed, and *ContextTranslate* is our Algorithm 3. It returns all generated test cases with their CC values.

ContextFuzz sets three maps P , \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{I} to empty and the counter i to 0 (line 1). P keeps the generated test cases. The entry $\mathcal{F}(x)$ in the map \mathcal{F} keeps the current β -AFO for the seed x . The map \mathcal{I} keeps the total number of β -AFO discovered for each seed in X .

Since each β -AFO represents a successful seed evolution resulting in a test case with the highest CC value up to the corresponding fuzzing attempt, we use the entry $\mathcal{I}(x)$ to bookkeep the number of successful evolutions experienced on x . As the potentials of different seeds to produce successful evolutions in the fuzzing campaign could be different, in lines 13–15, the algorithm sets up a power schedule [91], computing the energy of each seed (line 14) by the formula $\lceil \frac{m\mathcal{I}(x)}{\sum_{x \in X} \mathcal{I}(x)/|X|} \rceil$, which scales the average number of fuzzing attempts m by the relative number of successful evolutions experienced on x .

ContextFuzz iterates over X to initialize the above three maps (lines 2–11). Like other perturbation techniques (e.g., FGSM and ROB0T), it computes a clipped gradient for a seed x (denoted by $\text{PROCESSING}(x, r)$) and adds it to x to generate a test case x' , i.e., $x' = \text{clip}(x + \epsilon r)$ and $\|x - x'\|_p < \epsilon$ (line 4), where $r = \partial \text{obj} / \partial x$ in line 4. It also clips x' to ensure the generated test cases are within the lower and upper bound, such as 0 and 1 for normalized images. If x' is a failing test case (lines 5–6), *ContextFuzz* adds x' with its CC value $\text{CC}(x')$ to $P(x)$, sets $\mathcal{F}(x)$ to the gradient of x , and increments $\mathcal{I}(x)$ (lines 7–9).

In lines 12–24, the algorithm conducts fuzzing until exhausting the overall fuzzing budget. It picks the current seed x_i from X (line 16). It captures a set of β -AFOs for x_i by the object $AC(x_i)$ (line 17), where $AC(x_i)$ in the j^{th} iteration over lines 12–23 means $AC(x_i, j-1)$ in Section 3.3.4. As presented in Section 3.3.5, each β -AFO in $AC(x_i)$ is a perturbation that results in one representative test case of a seed that is seed-equivalent to x_i . CLOVER controls the fuzzing budget of this seed x_i to be $|AC(x_i)|$ to cut off the long tail. Specifically, $AC(x_i)$ is modeled as an object that conceptually contains the set of β -AFOs of these seeds in the equivalence class $[x_i]_{j-1}$ (at the immediately past fuzzing round $j-1$, where line 17 simply uses the notation $[x_i]$ to stand for the equivalence class $[x_i]_{j-1}$) maximally satisfying the condition $|AC(x_i)| \leq$ the energy of x_i and the set does not contain the β -AFO of x_i (line 17). Moreover, if $AC(x_i, j-1)$ is empty, the object $AC(x_i)$ is initialized to contain the β -AFO of x_i as its single element. As long as the fuzzing budget on x_i in the current fuzzing round has not been exhausted, if an element is requested from this object $AC(x_i)$ (which is modeled by an invocation of the $\text{pop}(\cdot)$ operation in line 3 of Algorithm 3), $AC(x_i).\text{pop}(\cdot)$ returns the β -AFO of a seed in the equivalent class that the object has never returned before.

In line 18, the algorithm calls *ContextTranslate* to generate test cases for the seed x_i . It passes the set $AC(x_i)$, the current β -AFO of x_i , and the highest CC value among all generated test cases of x_i kept in $P(x_i)$ (denoted by the function $\text{CC}_{\max}(\cdot)$) to *ContextTranslate*. *ContextTranslate* returns three results: $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ (which is updated to $\mathcal{F}(x_i)$), a sequence of test cases $Q(x_i)$ (which is appended to $P(x_i)$), and the number of times ($\#evolved$) that the evolution of the seed x_i in the invocation to *ContextTranslate* is regarded as successful (which is added to $\mathcal{I}(x_i)$ (lines 19–22). Line 23 resets the variable i to 0 if the whole X has been processed. Thus, the number of resets on i at line 22 (denoted by v here) and the current value of i maps to the fuzzing round j on the seed sequence Z presented in Section 3.3 are: $j = v|X| + i$ and $\text{SOURCE}(z_j) = X[i]$, where X refer to the input to this algorithm.

3.4.3 The ContextTranslate Algorithm. Algorithm 3 presents the (*ContextTranslate*) algorithm of CLOVER. It accepts six parameters: f is the model under test. x is the current seed under fuzzing. $AC(x)$ is the set of β -AFOs for x . $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ is

Algorithm 3: ContextTranslate: Seed-Equivalent Sequence-to-Sequence Translator

```

Input :  $f \leftarrow$  model under test
          $x \leftarrow$  seed for fuzzing
          $AC(x) \leftarrow$  set of  $\beta$ -AFOs for seeds that are seed-equivalent to  $x$ 
          $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}} \leftarrow$  current  $\beta$ -AFO of  $x$ 
          $\partial obj/\partial x \leftarrow$  gradient of  $x$ 
          $CC^* \leftarrow$  the highest CC value among the generated test cases from  $x$ 

Output: updated version of  $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ 
         test cases  $Q(x)$  for seed  $x$ 
         number of representative evolutions  $\#evolved$ 

1  $Q(x) = \emptyset, \#evolved = 0$ 
2 while  $|AC(x)| > 0$  and the overall budget is not exhausted do
3    $dir = AC(x).pop()$  ▷ a  $\beta$ -AFO due to seed equivalence
4    $\Delta'_{\beta\text{-AFO}} = dir + \Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}} + \partial obj/\partial x$ 
5    $x' = x + \text{PROCESSING}(x, \Delta'_{\beta\text{-AFO}})$ 
6   for  $r = 1$  to  $\lceil \epsilon/\delta \rceil$  do
7      $x' = x' + \text{PROCESSING}(x', \partial obj/\partial x')$  ▷ move  $x'$  along its gradient
8   end for
9    $f.predict(x')$ 
10  if ISADVERSARIAL( $x, x'$ ) then
11     $Q(x).add(x', CC(x'))$  ▷ keep the test case
12    if  $CC(x') > CC^*$  then
13       $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}} = x' - x$  ▷ maintain the  $\beta$ -AFO for  $x$ 
14       $CC^* = CC(x')$  ▷ maintain the highest CC value for  $x'$ 
15       $\#evolved = \#evolved + 1$  ▷ deem the seed evolution as successful
16    end if
17  end if
18 end while
19 return  $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}, Q(x), \#evolved$ 

```

the β -AFO of x obtained from the previous fuzzing rounds on x . $\partial obj/\partial x$ is the gradient of x . CC^* is the highest CC value among the test cases generated from x in all previous fuzzing rounds on x . The algorithm aims to generate a sequence of test case candidates for x with increasingly higher CC values, one such test case (unless discarded) for a β -AFO in $AC(x)$ if the budget allows.

ContextTranslate optimizes the procedure to track the β -AFO for x at the current fuzzing round. It iteratively generates test cases of x (lines 3–10) and places them into the set $Q(x)$ in line 11. The α -representative test case \bar{x} at the current fuzzing round is the one in $Q(x)$ with the highest CC value, and the α -AFO is thus $\bar{x} - x$. Specifically, suppose a test case x' of x is added to $Q(x)$. If x' also has a higher CC value than the CC value of the resulting sample of $x + \beta$ -AFO (line 12), it implies that the piece of difference represented by $x' - x$ is a newly discovered β -AFO for x at the current fuzzing round (lines 13–14). On the other hand, if the condition in line 12 is not satisfied, this α -AFO for x' is no longer tracked because it will not affect how the β -AFO for x is computed. To save effort, the algorithm also does not track which test case is the α -representative test case of the current seed occurrence.

In the rest of this subsection, we present the details of *ContextTranslate*.

Algorithm 4: ContextSelect: Context-Aware Test Suite Construction

```

Input :  $P \leftarrow$  pool of test cases
          $n \leftarrow$  the required size of the test suite
Output: list of  $n$  test cases
1  $X = P.keys()$ 
2 if  $P$  has no CC then
3   | compute  $CC(t)$  for each test case  $t$  in  $P$ 
4 end if
5  $\forall x \in X$ , Sort( $P(x)$ ) in descending order of CC
6  $A = \langle \rangle$ ,  $i = 1$ 
7 while  $|A| < n$  do
8   |  $layer = \{P(x)[i] \mid x \in X\}$ 
9   | if  $|layer| + |A| > n$  then
10  |   | Sort( $layer$ ) in descending order of CC
11  |   |  $layer = \langle layer[j] \rangle_{j \in [1, n - |A|]}$  ▷ get the top  $n - |A|$  elements
12  |   end if
13  |    $A = A + layer$  ▷ extend  $A$  with the current  $layer$ 
14  |    $i = i + 1$ 
15 end while
16 return  $A$ 

```

Algorithm 3 initializes the map $Q(x)$ to empty. It also sets the counter $\#evolved$ to 0, which counts the number of β -AFOs for the seed x generated by the current invocation of the algorithm. The map and the counter record the set of test cases and the number of β -AFOs generated by the current invocation of the algorithm for the seed x , respectively.

The algorithm iteratively applies the sequence of β -AFOs for x to produce a sequence of test cases (lines 2–18). In line 4, it combines the β -AFO of an equivalent seed of x (i.e., dir), the current β -AFO of x (i.e., $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$), and the gradient of x (i.e., $\partial obj/\partial x$) to pinpoint a sample x' in the vicinity of x . Like PGD, in lines 6–8, it iteratively moves x' along its gradient (for the reasons of achieving a high prediction on x). However, unlike PGD, it uses a typical cyclic learning rate schedule, which scales the clipped gradient by a cyclic learning rate $\lambda(r) = \lfloor \max \sin(\pi \cdot r / (\lceil \epsilon/\delta \rceil + 1)) \rfloor$, where $\sin(\cdot)$ is the sine function and \max is the maximum cyclic learning rate⁵. Specifically, in the j^{th} iteration, the algorithm computes a fractional clipped gradient, i.e., $x' = clip(x' + \epsilon \lambda(j) \partial obj/\partial x')$ and $\|x - x'\|_p < \epsilon$.

After having perturbed x' , it applies f to infer x' for prediction label inspection (line 9).

In lines 10–17, the algorithm maintains its data structure for tracking the generated test cases and adversarial front objects for x . Specifically, if x' is adversarial (line 10), it adds x' and its CC value (which is $CC(x')$) to the map $Q(x)$ (line 11). Moreover, if x' is higher than all historical test cases of x measured in CC (line 12), the algorithm updates $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ to $x' - x$ (line 13), updates CC^* to $CC(x)$ (line 14), and increments the counter $\#evolved$ (line 15).

The algorithm finally returns $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$, $Q(x)$, and $\#evolved$ (line 19).

⁵Previous works (e.g., [63, 79, 82]) inspire us that using a uniform step size in training could be ineffective for stepping into certain regions due to the regularity in stepping. The design of this cyclic learning rate schedule is to complete one cycle by walking through all the steps from $i = 1$ to $\lceil \epsilon/\delta \rceil$, which will lead to a series of periodic values changing from 0 to 1 then 0. Using the term $\lceil \epsilon/\delta \rceil + 1$ in the denominator follows a typical design in activation functions to avoid the division-by-zero error. The number of steps ($\lceil \epsilon/\delta \rceil$) corresponds to walking through one cycle of the cyclic learning rate schedule.

3.4.4 The ContextSelect Algorithm. Algorithm 4 presents the *ContextSelect* test case selection strategy. It accepts two parameters: a pool of test cases P and the required number n of test cases to be selected. In the map P , the key is a seed, and the value is a set of test cases with their CC values.

Algorithm 4 collects the seeds stored in P into a set X (line 1). It computes the CC values for these test cases if missing (lines 2–4). In line 5, it sorts the test cases in $P(x)$ for each seed $x \in X$ in descending order of CC. Line 6 initializes an empty list A and sets the counter i as 1. Lines 7–15 iteratively include test cases with higher CC values of each seed into A . Each iteration performs the following: The algorithm collects the i^{th} test case of each seed $x \in X$ into *layer* (line 8). Then, it checks whether the size of *layer* is larger than the number of samples remaining to be selected (line 9). If this is the case, it sorts *layer* in descending order of CC (line 10) and trims *layer* by dropping the samples beyond the number of samples to be selected (line 11). Next, it appends *layer* to A (line 13) and increments the counter i by 1 (line 14). Line 16 returns the prioritized test suite A .

3.5 Tracking the Equivalence Classes for Seed Equivalence

The *ContextFuzz* algorithm requires knowing an equivalence class in line 17 of Algorithm 2 at each fuzzing round, which can be computed efficiently: linear to the number of seeds in X plus the number of test cases generated by the *ContextTranslate* algorithm. We recall that if the current iteration in the conceptual model of CLOVER is j , then the notation $[x]$ in line 17 refers to the equivalence class $[x]_{j-1}$ in Definition 3.1.

Suppose \mathcal{G} is a $p \times q$ matrix, and N is a vector of size p . The number of rows p of \mathcal{G} equals the number of class labels, representing the possible seed labels of a sample returned by SEMANTIC(.). The number of columns q of \mathcal{G} equals the number of class labels plus 1, representing the possible adversarial labels of a sample. The additional column, denoted by \perp , indicates that the seed is not marked with any adversarial label.

The matrix is first initialized at line 3 of Algorithm 2. It places each seed $x \in X$ to the cell $\mathcal{G}(c, \perp)$ where c is the label returned by SEMANTIC(x) and sets $N[x] = \perp$. Since $\mathcal{F}(x)$ is initialized as 0 (i.e., no difference), the β -AFO for x at this moment is 0.

Checking the condition ISADVERSARIAL(x, x') in line 6 of Algorithm 2 further triggers the updates of \mathcal{G} and N . If the condition is satisfied, we move the corresponding seed x from the cell $\mathcal{G}(c, \perp)$ to the cell $\mathcal{G}(c, v)$, where c is the label returned by SEMANTIC(x) and v is the adversarial label of x' obtained from this line 6. It also updates the cell $N[x]$ to v .

In each invocation of the *ContextTranslate* algorithm for the seed x as the value for input parameter x , whenever line 11 of Algorithm 3 executes, we get the adversarial label (denoted by v) from line 9 of Algorithm 3. The sample x is thus removed from the cell $\mathcal{G}(c, N[x])$ and added to the cell $\mathcal{G}(c, v)$. The cell $N[x]$ is updated to v as well.

The seeds in the equivalence class needed in line 17 of Algorithm 2 is the full set of seeds in the cell $\mathcal{G}(c, N[x])$.

4 EXPERIMENT

This section presents the experiment to evaluate CLOVER in the scope of the testing-retraining pipeline that is configured with CLOVER as the DL testing technique to improve the robustness of DL models. The tool, the source code, the model weights, the results, and the data sets of the experiments are available at [6].

4.1 Research Questions

As presented in Section 2.4, the AM methodology includes a testing-retraining pipeline. Like the experiments presented in [15, 70], the pipeline can be configured into two configurations. In Configuration A, the pipeline constructs a test suite by selecting test cases from a given test pool via a configured DL testing technique. This configuration refers to

the scenario for applying a test case selection technique (e.g., DeepGini [19]), where users provide a test pool to the overall workflow before the testing-retraining pipeline in the workflow is executed. In Configuration B, the pipeline generates a test suite via a configured DL fuzzing technique, which is a scenario of test case generation. Corresponding to these two configurations, we refer to CLOVER with P in line 2 of Algorithm 1 input from an external source and line 1 of Algorithm 1 deleted as **CLOVER in Configuration A**, and the original CLOVER as **CLOVER in Configuration B**.

To align with the setting in these experiments of DL testing techniques for robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline in the literature [15, 19, 22, 23, 25, 44, 49, 50, 70, 86, 93], in our main experiment (for answering research questions RQ1–RQ5 below), we evaluate CLOVER in both configurations by studying the robustness-oriented quality of the constructed test suites and the robust accuracy improvement⁶ achieved by CLOVER on clean models. Additionally, we evaluate the performance of CLOVER on adversarially trained DL models by an exploratory study through the experiment for answering research question RQ6.

Specifically, we aim to answer the following six research questions.

- RQ1: To what extent is CLOVER in Configuration A effective in constructing test suites for robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline?
- RQ2: Is there any difference in robustness improvement by using test suites with different CC values constructed by CLOVER in Configuration A delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline?
- RQ3: To what extent is CLOVER in Configuration B effective in robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline? How about the robustness-oriented quality of the constructed test suites?
- RQ4: To what extent is CLOVER in Configuration B effective in robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline if the fuzzing technique is configured with an existing state-of-the-art testing metric instead of the testing metric CC to identify test cases? How about the robustness-oriented quality of the constructed test suites?
- RQ5: To what extent do the major design decisions and hyperparameters to configure CLOVER in Configuration B affect the performance of CLOVER in robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline?
- RQ6: To what extent is CLOVER effective in test case generation on adversarially trained models for the model validation purpose?

RQ1 and RQ2 evaluate the effectiveness of CLOVER in Configuration A, and RQ3 to RQ4 evaluate CLOVER in Configuration B. Like the previous experiments [15, 19, 23, 32, 70, 93], the pair RQ1 and RQ3 assess the effectiveness of CLOVER in robust accuracy improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline. The pair RQ2 and RQ4 assess the effects of configuring CLOVER with the metric CC and other peer metrics on the corresponding robust accuracy improvement. Furthermore, on the one hand, CLOVER in Configuration A does not generate test cases (and thus RQ1 and RQ2 do not study the ability of CLOVER to generate test cases). On the other hand, CLOVER in Configuration B generates test cases. In RQ3 and RQ4, we additionally evaluate CLOVER about the robustness-oriented quality of the constructed test suites produced by the technique. RQ5 explores the key design decisions and hyperparameters in formulating a fuzzing attempt in the CLOVER algorithm to study the extent these factors affect CLOVER in achieving robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline. To explore the effect of fuzzing on adversarially trained models, we further evaluate CLOVER on these models about its robustness-oriented quality of the generated test cases through RQ6.

⁶We note that the literature on DL model fuzzing [15, 23, 50, 70, 97] has reiterated that this measurement metric is very important in studying the effectiveness of fuzzing techniques for DL model testing.

We should note again that robustness improvement is achieved through applying the test suite constructed by a DL testing technique to a retraining step in the pipeline. Thus, through the comparison between different DL testing techniques to construct test suites and apply their test suites to the same retraining step with the same DL model under retraining, one can compare the relative robustness improvement of these DL testing techniques in a controlled manner.

4.2 Experimental Setup

This subsection details the experimental setup to answer the research questions.

4.2.1 Implementation. We implement our test framework in tensorflow-gpu 2.4.0 on a computer with Ubuntu 20.04 equipped with an Intel Xeon Gold 6136 processor, 256GB RAM, and an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080Ti GPU card with 12GB VRAM. We implement all techniques on it after porting ADAPT and ROBOT from their publicly-available code repositories [4, 5]. The ROBOT code repository includes the implementations of PGD and FGSM. We also reuse their implementations after porting. We adopt the retraining script [5] of ROBOT for all techniques to retrain each model under test 40 epochs and refer to it as RETRAIN. The retraining script $\text{RETRAIN}(f, A)$ follows the typical finetuning training procedure on a test suite A (which is the set of selected test cases) and the original training dataset of the model under test f to reduce the training error. We configure the learning rate of the retraining script with the learning rate value appearing at the end of the training process for each corresponding model under test, i.e., 0.0001 for cases ①, ③, ④ and 0.001 for ② in Table 1.

We have ensured all models converged in the training/retraining processes of our experiments. We enable early stopping in the scripts to reduce overfitting when training the DL models under test by calling the “EarlyStopping” API in the callback and restoring the best weights of models.⁷

The testing-retraining pipeline is to apply a DL testing technique on a model f to construct a test suite A , followed by applying $\text{RETRAIN}(f, A)$ to obtain a retrained model f' . We adopt the pipeline script provided by [5]. The robust dataset to assess DL models f and its retrained version f' will be introduced in Section 4.2.7.

4.2.2 Datasets. We adopt the following four datasets as our benchmark datasets: FashionMnist [81], SVHN [48], CIFAR10 [33], and CIFAR100 [33]. The FashionMnist and CIFAR10 datasets each contain ten classes with 5000 training and 1000 test images. The SVHN dataset contains 73257 digits for training and 26032 digits for testing, divided into ten classes. The CIFAR100 dataset contains 60000 samples with 500 training and 100 test images, divided into 100 classes. For each benchmark dataset, we construct the validation dataset by randomly sampling 5000 images from the downloaded training dataset, where the remaining images serve as the training samples, and we use the downloaded test datasets as our (clean) test datasets.

4.2.3 DL Models for Benchmark. Like the experiments presented in existing work [15, 25, 30, 36, 49, 50, 70, 83, 84], to evaluate CLOVER, we select several DL models for this purpose: VGG16 [61], LeNet5 [35], ResNet20 [28], and ResNet56 [28]. We include an earlier model, LeNet5 [35], because ROBOT [70] is the state-of-the-art robustness-oriented fuzzing technique to generate test cases for robustness testing, and its experiment uses LeNet5 extensively. DL testing and maintenance research [13, 15, 25, 49, 70, 75, 83, 84] widely use the other three DL models for experiments.

⁷In our pre-experiment, we have also attempted to use another popular approach to early stopping: Keeping each model after each training/retraining epoch and selecting the one right before the change of validation accuracy turns direction after reaching the maximum (despite the small variations) when studying CLOVER on cases ①–④. From our data analyses on their results, we do not spot any noticeable difference from the present results reported in RQ1–RQ5 in this paper.

⁸“Ratio” refers to the proportion of samples in each batch to be replaced with their adversarial counterparts in the function *BasicIterativeMethod* [8] for data augmentation.

Table 1. Benchmark Cases of Clean Models (Baselines)

Case	Dataset	Model	Parameters	Training Accuracy	Validation Accuracy	Test Accuracy
①	FashionMnist	VGG16	33,624,202	97.24	94.18	93.77
②	SVHN	LeNet5	136,886	90.14	89.38	88.98
③	CIFAR10	ResNet20	273,066	92.16	89.38	88.45
④	CIFAR100	ResNet56	867,620	72.78	60.52	61.49

Table 2. Benchmark Cases of Adversarially Trained Models (Baselines)⁸

Case	Dataset	Model	Ratio	Parameters	Training Accuracy	Validation Accuracy	Test Accuracy
⑤	CIFAR10	ResNet20	50%	273,066	90.98	84.72	84.26
⑥	CIFAR10	ResNet20	100%	273,066	86.93	82.04	81.58
⑦	CIFAR100	ResNet56	50%	867,620	77.22	58.26	59.20
⑧	CIFAR100	ResNet56	100%	867,620	70.92	55.72	56.74

We adopt their existing implementations and training scripts of model architectures from the official TensorFlow library and train them from scratch on the clean training and validation datasets for each benchmark. We evaluate the resulting models on their test datasets, where we observe that the test accuracy of each model matches the published benchmark values in the literature [1, 2, 5, 7]. Table 1 summarizes the number of parameters, training accuracy, validation accuracy, and test accuracy of each model under test. We index these four models as cases ①, ②, ③, and ④, respectively.

Apart from applying CLOVER and peer fuzzing techniques as a DL testing technique in a testing-retraining pipeline, we also explore an alternate scenario to use CLOVER and peer fuzzing techniques to quality assure the retrained models (i.e., adversarially trained models) that are produced by the pipeline of pure adversarial training. Specifically, we start from the above-mentioned trained models as the DL models under test and further adversarially retrain them to produce four adversarially trained models, summarized in Table 2. We index these four models as cases ⑤–⑧.⁹ We will apply each of CLOVER and peer fuzzing techniques on these adversarially trained models to generate test cases. To facilitate the comparison, we use test suites of the same size to compare the robustness-oriented quality of the respective test suites, where the measurement metrics will be introduced in Section 4.2.8.

Specifically, we follow [8, 44, 62] to adopt the widely-used IBM adversarial robustness toolbox (ART) version 1.17 [8] to adversarially retrain the models in cases ③ and ④ to produce models indexed as cases ⑤–⑧ with the function *AdversarialTrainer* with the default hyperparameters and the function *BasicIterativeMethod* [8] for data augmentation with the parameter “*ratio*” (which is a parameter to specify the proportion of samples in each batch to be replaced with their adversarial example counterparts)¹⁰. The models in cases ⑤ and ⑥ are retrained from case ③, and the models in cases ⑦ and ⑧ are retrained from case ④, both with the values of ratio set to 0.5 and 1.0, respectively.

We note that our infrastructure is built on top of TensorFlow. To identify adversarially *pretrained* models on our datasets and architecture, we have attempted to port those models built on Pytorch to Tensorflow via ONNX [11],

⁹We note that the experiments reported in a vast majority of existing DL fuzzing literature [22, 23, 25, 30, 36, 49, 50, 70, 84, 86] did not report the results on fuzzing adversarially trained DL models.

¹⁰The article [62] is a supplementary document of the article [78] to present the experiments of the latter article. ART [8] is a popular automated adversarial robustness toolbox and does not require users to provide hyperparameters such as the learning rate and the early stopping rule.

but we have found that ONNX nonetheless has produced converted models with severe losses in accuracy. So, we do not adopt these converted models. We have also attempted to search on the web about the well-maintained official repository of pretrained models implemented on Tensorflow for our datasets but failed. Therefore, we choose to adopt the state-of-the-art framework ART, which automatically trains a model without user interventions to provide hyperparameters such as the learning rate and early stopping criteria to the ART. We have also attempted to produce adversarially trained models of cases ① and ②. However, we have observed that the application of adversarial training using *BasicIterativeMethod* and *AdversarialTrainer* [8] function on cases ① and ② led to a significant decrease in test accuracy. For instance, ART reduces the test accuracy of the resulting models by more than 70% when setting *ratio* to 1.0 for *BasicIterativeMethod* on SVHN with LeNet5. Thus, we exclude their adversarially trained versions as subjects in our experiments.

4.2.4 Selection Universes for Test Case Selection. In Configuration A, a DL testing technique selects test cases from a test pool, referred to as the *selection universe* in this paper, to construct test suites. To conduct a fair controlled experiment, the previous work [15, 70] prepared one or more common baselines for each dataset for all techniques to select test cases from it to construct test suites. We follow this practice in our experiment. Specifically, we prepare three common baselines for each dataset for all test case selection techniques to select samples from it for test case construction and check the robustness improvement effects of the constructed test suites through the testing-retraining pipeline.

The first selection universe follows the setting presented in [70]. It uses FGSM [24] and PGD [45] (see Section 2.2.2 for the introduction of these two techniques) to generate the test pool because they are frequently used as baselines to benchmark techniques in many experiments and easily produce many hard adversarial examples. Following [15, 70], we configure each of FGSM [24] and PGD [45] in Configuration A to run on the training dataset of each model under test to generate 50000 test cases. The first selection universe $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$ is the union of these two sets of test cases (100000 in total).

The second and the third selection universes P_{train}^{ADAPT} and P_{train}^{ROBOT} are generated by ADAPT and ROBOT on the training dataset of each model under test, respectively. We configure ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively, to run 18000 seconds, the maximum fuzzing budget used for our whole experiment. The descriptive statistics of P_{train}^{ADAPT} and P_{train}^{ROBOT} are shown in Table 9 and discuss in Section 9.

4.2.5 Peer Techniques. CLOVER in Configuration A does not generate any test cases. Rather, it selects test cases from test pools. As such, we compare it with four peer test case selection techniques: RANDOM, DEEPGINI [19], BE-ST [70], and KM-ST [70]. RANDOM is the widely used baseline in the experiments of software engineering research. It randomly selects n samples from a given set of test cases. The next three techniques have been reviewed in Section 2.2.2, which, in brief, select test cases in descending order of the Gini index, among the top-performing test cases and worse-performing test cases in terms of FOL values, and among test cases from each equally-divided subrange of FOL values, respectively.

We compare CLOVER in Configuration B (the original Algorithms 1–4) with ADAPT [36] and ROBOT [70]. Both peer techniques have been reviewed in Section 2.2.2. They represent state-of-the-art coverage-based and loss-based fuzzing techniques, respectively. We configure each of the two fuzzing techniques to apply KM-ST to construct a subset A of the set of test cases generated by the fuzzing technique. We adopt KM-ST rather than BE-ST because the effect of robustness improvement for both BE-ST and KM-ST are similar in ROBOT’s original experiment (their Fig. 7) [70], and KM-ST is more effective than BE-ST in most cases in our Experiment 1 as summarized in Fig. 8 of the present paper.

4.2.6 Hyperparameters. We use the default setting of Adam in the official TensorFlow library for training the clean models, where Adam uses 0.001 as the initial learning rate. It reduces the rate after 50 epochs by a factor of 10 at every 30 epochs. We observed the learning rates stopped at 0.0001 for cases ①, ③, and ④, and 0.001 for ② when the training process finished. FGSM and PGD are set to have the step size of 0.03 with a single step, and 0.03/6 with ten steps each, respectively, for cases ① and ②, and of 0.01 with a single step, and 0.01/6 with ten steps each, respectively, for cases ③ and ④ by following [5, 70]. The step size and single step size of cases ③ and ④ are also used for cases ⑤–⑧ in *BasicIterativeMethod* [8] to generate adversarially trained models.

We follow [36, 70] to set up ADAPT: the activation threshold for the neuron coverage [50] is 0.5. The time budget for each seed is 10 seconds for cases ①–③ and 20 seconds for cases ④. We follow [70] to set the hyperparameters of ROBOT (presented in the original symbols in [70]): $\xi = 10^{-18}$, $k = 5$, $\lambda = 1$, and $iters = 3$. Other hyperparameters, including the number of sections for KM-ST to be 4, are set according to its source code [5].

For CLOVER, we set p -norm = L_∞ -norm, $k = 20$, $m = 5$, $\delta = 0.01$, and $max = 0.2$. We set $\epsilon = 0.05$ for cases ①–④ and $\epsilon = 0.025$ for cases ⑤–⑧. We choose these values for ϵ to ensure that the distance between each seed and their test cases on average is comparable to peer techniques for the purpose of comparison.¹¹ The current values of k and m are based on some experimental trials (see Section 4.2.9). We set δ to 0.01 because it is the smallest value with two decimal places (where a number with two decimal places is popularly stated as the value for measuring a perturbation bound in the literature on DL model testing[30, 50]), much smaller than ϵ . The number of steps $\lceil \epsilon/\delta \rceil$ in Algorithm 3 is 5. The current value for max is chosen so that the learning rate schedule can complete one cycle. Therefore, the maximum cyclic learning rate max for each step is set to $1/5 = 0.2$.

ADAPT and ROBOT perform test case generations while measuring the L_2 -norm distance between a seed and its test cases in their experiments [36, 70], but their papers do not present how to find the specific value for the fuzzing boundary ϵ in their experiments. Our experiment follows the default parameters specified in their repositories and follows ADAPT to measure the mean L_2 -norm distances for ADAPT, ROBOT, and CLOVER between the seeds and their test cases, respectively. The results for ADAPT, ROBOT, and CLOVER are summarized below, from left to right in each case.

- Case ①: 0.57, 0.34, 0.08.
- Case ②: 0.06, 0.06, 0.05.
- Case ③: 0.05, 0.12, 0.05.
- Case ④: 0.07, 0.08, 0.07.
- Case ⑤: 0.03, 0.03, 0.03.
- Case ⑥: 0.03, 0.03, 0.03.
- Case ⑦: 0.04, 0.03, 0.03.
- Case ⑧: 0.03, 0.03, 0.03.

Although CLOVER uses the L_∞ -norm distance, the mean L_2 -norm distance of the test cases generated by CLOVER is similar to these generated by ADAPT or ROBOT – the test cases generated by ADAPT and ROBOT in our experiments are not more restrictive than these generated by CLOVER.

4.2.7 Test Dataset and Robustness Assessment Universe. We adopt the downloaded test dataset of each model under test (① to ④) as our test dataset. We follow the methodology in [15, 70] to construct our robustness assessment universe, named P_{test} . Specifically, we repeat the procedure that generates $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$ presented in Section 4.2.4 to

¹¹Initially, we chose $\epsilon = 0.05$ for cases ⑤–⑧. However, after fuzzing these models, we found that the corresponding mean L_2 -norm distances of the selected test cases are larger than those for ADAPT and ROBOT, which are listed in the paragraph after the present paragraph in the main text of the paper. Therefore, we reduced it by half and observed that the resulting mean L_2 -norm distances achieved by CLOVER became comparable with these for ADAPT and ROBOT.

generate 20000 test cases for each of P_{test} from the samples in the corresponding test dataset instead of 100000 test cases for $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$ from the samples in the corresponding training dataset.

4.2.8 Evaluation Metrics. Apart from measuring the CC values, we measure the robustness-oriented quality of the constructed test suites and the robustness improvement achieved by a technique delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline.

Suppose a fuzzing technique generates a test suite A from a seed list X or constructs a test suite A from a selection universe when testing a DL model f .

We measure the mean CC value of A , denoted by $\#CC$, defined as $\sum_{t \in A} CC(t) \div |A|$.

The metrics $\#AdvLabel$ [22, 36, 86] and $\#Category$ [22, 36, 84, 86] measure the number of unique adversarial labels per seed at the test suite level and the number of seeds that the technique *can* produce test cases (kept in A) from them, respectively. We simply refer to these two metrics as the number of unique adversarial labels and the number of unique categories, respectively. It is important to ensure the diversity of the generated test suite and test cases, as failures exposed from the same seed can indicate the existence of a common defect in the model [22, 86]. The inclusion of diverse test cases provides valuable feedback to developers, which helps them better understand the problem at hand and improves the overall robustness of the model [22, 36, 43, 84, 86].

$\#AdvLabel$ [22, 36, 86] achieved by a technique on testing f by generating a test suite A is the total number of unique pairs of a seed in X and an adversarial label of any test cases (in A) of the seed, defined as $|\{(x, f(t)) \mid x \in X \wedge t \in A \wedge x \text{ is the seed for the test case } t\}|$. It measures the diversity and magnitude of the misclassification patterns captured by the test suites produced by the technique.

$\#Category$ [22, 36, 84, 86] for a technique is the number of seeds having at least one test case in A , defined as $|\{x \mid x \in X \wedge t \in A \wedge x \text{ is the seed for the test case } t\}|$. It measures the scope of coverage achieved by the technique to produce adversarial examples successfully from the pool X .

A higher $\#AdvLabel$ or a higher $\#Category$ achieved by a test suite indicates that the test suite successfully contains more misclassification patterns, thereby the technique constructing the test suite considered to be more effective in test suite construction [22, 36, 84, 86].

To evaluate a DL testing technique on robustness improvement on clean models delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline, we measure the resulting robust accuracy improvement following the experiments presented in the most recent research in the field [15, 19, 22, 23, 32, 44, 68, 70, 86, 93]. Suppose the DL model f is retrained on A and the original training dataset to produce a retrained model f' . We refer to the proportion of samples in the robustness assessment universe P_{test} such that f' predicts their labels to the ground truth labels in top-1 prediction as the **robust accuracy** achieved by the technique. We compute the **robust accuracy improvement achieved by the technique** by subtracting the robust accuracy of f on P_{test} from the robust accuracy of f' on P_{test} .

We measure the CC values of the test cases in A on each of f and f' and reorder A in ascending order of CC values to produce a reordered list (denoted as U for f and V for f'). The **mean CC reduction** achieved by the technique is the total change in CC values of the samples in the same index positions from f to f' , which is computed as $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq |A|} (CC(U[i]) - CC(V[i])) \div |A|$.

4.2.9 Experimental Procedure. We conduct the following experiments to answer the RQs.

Experiment 1 (for Answering RQ1): In the first sub-experiment (Experiment 1a), for each model (cases ①–④), we run CLOVER in Configuration A to select n_1 test cases from the selection universe $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$ of the model, which

outputs a test suite for each n_1 in $N_1 = \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000, 8000, 10000, 20000\}$. We apply the testing-retraining pipeline to get a retrained model for each such test suite. We measure the robust accuracy of each retrained model and compute the robust accuracy improvement. We repeat Experiment 1a except that we use each of p_{train}^{ADAPT} and p_{train}^{ROBOT} instead of $p_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$, referred to as Experiment 1b and 1c. (We choose n_1 up to 20000 because the original experiments [70] of KM-ST and BE-ST use a similar range.) We repeat Experiments 1a, 1b, and 1c except for using each of RANDOM, DEEPGINI, BE-ST, and KM-ST instead of *ContextSelect*. As such, each technique constructs 84 test suites and 84 retrained models.

We conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test [80] at the 5% significance level with Bonferroni correction on the robust accuracy improvements achieved by each of DEEPGINI, BE-ST, KM-ST, and CLOVER compared to those achieved by RANDOM on each selection universe over all four cases as a whole. (We pair the robust accuracy improvements of all techniques by the same combination of test suite size and selection universe.) We also calculate the effect size by Cohen’s d [20] to check whether the difference in robust accuracy improvement of each pair of techniques is observable. The effect size measures the strength of the relationship between two variables in a population divided into several magnitudes, including 0.01, 0.20, 0.50, 0.80, 1.20, and 2.0, corresponding to very small, small, medium, large, very large, and huge strength levels [20]. If the effect size is at a low strength level (e.g., small and very small), the difference between the two lists is negligible, even if the p -value indicates a significant difference.

Experiment 2 (for Answering RQ2): We reorder the selection universe $p_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$ in ascending order of CC value. (Note that a CC value ranges over $[0, 1]$.) We divide the reordered list into five consecutive sections with an equal range of CC values, i.e., $N_2 = \{[0, 0.2], (0.2, 0.4], (0.4, 0.6], (0.6, 0.8], (0.8, 1]\}$ so that each section only keeps the test cases with CC values within its range. We then run CLOVER in Configuration A to output a test suite A containing n_3 test cases for each possible value $n_3 \in N_3 = \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000\}$ ¹². We repeat the experiment using RANDOM instead of CLOVER. It represents a state of the practice of using a random subset of a selection universe to construct a test suite for retraining the model under test. We measure the robust accuracy improvement achieved by each technique after applying the test suite to get a retrained model delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline.

Experiment 3 (for Answering RQ3): We construct a subset X , containing 18000 samples of the training dataset of each clean model (cases ①–④). Same as Experiment 2, we set the number of selected test cases to $n_3 \in N_3 = \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000\}$. We then conduct the following experiment on CLOVER in Configuration B (named Experiment 3a): We run CLOVER on each model under test with the seed list X and set n_4 seconds as the total fuzzing time budget to generate a test suite, and also keep all the generated test cases as a test pool, denoted as *All*, i.e., without selection. We conduct the above procedure for each n_4 in $N_4 = \{1800, 3600, 7200, 18000\}$. We measure $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ of the constructed test suites and the robust accuracy improvement achieved by CLOVER after applying each such test suite via the testing-retraining pipeline. We further repeat Experiment 3a except using each of ADAPT and ROBOT instead of CLOVER (named Experiments 3b and 3c, respectively).

Moreover, for each pair of a model under test and a respective retrained model produced via the testing-retraining pipeline via CLOVER, we measure the CC value of each test case in each test suite generated by CLOVER and the corresponding mean CC reduction under the setting of $n_3 \in N_3$ and $n_4=18000$.

We repeat Experiment 3 three times to alleviate the influence of randomness in the experiment.

¹²This range is chosen because in the original experiments of ADAPT and ROBOT, they select no more than 10% of generated test cases for retraining a model under test. Or, in the case of ROBOT, its experiment only sets to fuzz a model with 300 to 1200 seconds and uses all the generated test cases for model retraining.

Experiment 4 (for Answering RQ4): We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we use the test case prioritization metric Gini adopted by DEEPGINI and the loss-based metric FOL proposed by ROBOT to replace our CC metric in CLOVER, and also use DEEPGINI and KM-ST to replace line 2 of Algorithm 1, named Experiments 4a and 4b, respectively.

Experiment 5 (for Answering RQ5): In this series of experiments, we explore alternatives to the key design decisions and vary the hyperparameters in the CLOVER algorithm to study to what extent CLOVER in Configuration B is sensitive to these settings on clean models. Experiment 5 consists of several sub-experiments, which we will present in turn.

Two main ideas implemented in CLOVER are to find test cases of the same seed with higher CC values and perturb test cases based on seed equivalence. To know the extent of their effects contributing to the robustness improvement effectiveness of CLOVER delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline, we create two variants of CLOVER. The first variant of CLOVER, named CLOVER+SMALLEST, finds test cases of the same seed with lower CC values. The second variant, named CLOVER+SINGLEDIR, ablates the use of the seed equivalence information in perturbing a test case so that the gradient direction provided to perturb the test case only depends on the given seed and the existing test case of the seed that achieves the highest CC values so far for that fuzzing attempt. The experimental procedures to apply these two variants to generate test cases are presented as Experiments 5a and 5b, respectively.

Experiment 5a for CLOVER+SMALLEST: We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we modify line 12 in Algorithm 3 from “if $CC(x') > CC^*$ then” to “if $CC(x') < CC^*$ then”, where CC^* is modified to keep the lowest CC value among the generated test case from the same seed (instead of highest one in the original CLOVER). Also, we modify line 10 in Algorithm 4 from “Sort(*layer*) in descending order of CC” to “Sort(*layer*) in ascending order of CC”. We measure the difference in mean robust accuracy improvement achieved by the CLOVER variant and that achieved by CLOVER in Experiment 3a.

Experiment 5b for CLOVER+SINGLEDIR: We repeat Experiment 5a, except that we modify line 4 in Algorithm 3 from “ $\Delta'_{\beta-AFO} = dir + \Delta_{\beta-AFO} + \partial obj / \partial x$ ” to “ $\Delta'_{\beta-AFO} = \partial obj / \partial x$ ” instead of the modification stated in Experiment 5a.

In the algorithmic design of CLOVER, there are several hyperparameters that contribute to the formulation of a fuzzing attempt. While the design itself does not prioritize one fuzzing attempt over another in terms of time spent or sensitivity to the model type, certain hyperparameters, i.e., m , k , δ , p -norm, and ϵ may potentially impact the performance of fuzzing attempts according to intuition and empirical evidence. Therefore, we conduct a study to examine the influence of these hyperparameters on cases ①–④ within the robust accuracy improvement achieved through the testing-retraining pipeline.

First, CLOVER requires users to provide an estimate of the average resources allocated to fuzz a seed, which is represented by the hyperparameter m . Intuitively, using a larger m , more fuzzing attempts on a seed will be conducted, which may discover test cases with higher CC values than using a smaller m . Nonetheless, fuzzing is a time-constrained test activity. Spending more fuzzing attempts on one seed implies allocating fewer fuzzing attempts on the other seed if the two fuzzing campaigns spend the same amount of total time. What we are unclear is whether the difference is small, and if this is the case, using a smaller m to allow the fuzzing technique to fuzz on more seeds within the same time budget seems to be a viable choice. The corresponding experimental procedure is presented as Experiment 5c.

Experiment 5c: We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we use each $m \in \{3, 5, 7, 9\}$ instead of keeping m to 5.

Second, in each fuzzing attempt, CLOVER makes a ballpark estimation of the contextual confidence of each test case, which requires collecting the prediction probability of k data points in the surrounding of the test case. Intuitively,

having a larger k produces a more accurate estimation, and yet evolutionary algorithms generally do not require accurate estimation to evolve its elements in each evolution attempt. Furthermore, CLOVER discovers test cases by seed equivalence where its algorithmic design is to apply the β -AFOs achieved by some other test cases to assist the evolution of the current test case. Thus, it is unclear the extent of benefits brought by obtaining a more accurate estimation to CLOVER. We thus vary k to study the effect of k , where its experimental procedure is summarized as Experiment 5d.

Experiment 5d: We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we use each $k \in \{5, 10, 20, 40\}$ instead of keeping k to 5.

Third, in estimating the contextual confidence in each fuzzing attempt, CLOVER selects several data points within a perturbation bound δ . As presented in Section 3, CLOVER is developed in the background of $\delta \ll \epsilon$. We vary δ to evaluate the sensitivity of CLOVER on this hyperparameter, which is presented in Experiment 5e. Intuitively, even δ becomes smaller, as adversarial examples widely exist around samples within many different fuzzing bounds in the literature, we tend to believe that the differences in effect could be small. On the other hand, as δ becomes close to ϵ , more perturbed samples are seriously clipped, which in essence, makes the resulting sample use the information of $\Delta_{\beta\text{-AFO}}$ less effectively.

Experiment 5e: We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we use each $\delta \in \{0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05\}$ instead of keeping δ to 0.01.

Fourth, in measuring the distance between two data points, CLOVER uses the notion of p -norm distance, which is popular in machine learning. We design the CLOVER algorithm to compute the probability values of the adversarial label of the test case observed on the surrounding data points of that test case. This design naturally leads to the use of L_∞ -norm, which is to find the maximum value in the prediction vector of each such surrounding data point. Changing L_∞ -norm to another p -norm, such as L_2 -norm, will unavoidably destroy the notion of contextual confidence. Therefore, to keep the essence of CLOVER, we do not change how CC is computed. On the other hand, to apply the other p -norm distance in generating perturbed data, the `PROCESSING(.)` function called in lines 5 and 7 of Algorithm 3 is modified to skip clipping x' with ϵ . We also modify line 10 from “if `ISADVERSARIAL(x, x')` then” to “if `ISADVERSARIAL(x, x')` and $\|x - x'\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ then” in Algorithm 3 to filter out x' if its L_2 -norm distance to x is larger than ϵ . Experiment 5f below describes the experimental procedure for this variant of CLOVER.

Experiment 5f: We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we use each type of p -norm, where $p \in \{L_\infty, L_2\}$. To make the mean L_2 -norm distance of generated test cases similar to those generated by CLOVER in Experiment 3a (see Section 4.2.6), after several trials, we adjust and set ϵ to 0.10, 0.06, 0.10, and 0.08 for cases ① to ④, respectively.

Lastly, any fuzzing technique is configured with a fuzzing bound. Varying the fuzzing bound is a typical ablation study in many experiments. Following the results in the literature [9, 58, 59, 79, 82], in general, we expect that using a larger bound can produce a larger robust accuracy improvement.

Experiment 5g: We repeat Experiment 3a with $n_4=18000$, except that we use each $\epsilon \in \{0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.07\}$ instead of keeping ϵ to 0.05.

Experiment 6 (for Answering RQ6): To explore an alternative use of CLOVER for quality assurance of DL models, we use the test dataset of each adversarially trained model as the seed list X ¹³, which contains 10000 test cases, to attack the model. Same as Experiment 3a, we set the number of selected test cases to $n_3 \in N_3 = \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000\}$.

We conduct the following experiment on CLOVER in Configuration B (named Experiment 6a): we run CLOVER on each adversarially trained model with the seed list X and set $n_4 = 18000$ seconds as the total fuzzing time budget to

¹³we randomly sample 10000 samples from the SVHN test dataset.

generate a test suite, and keep all the generated test cases into a test pool, denoted as *All*, i.e., without selection. We measure $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ on these test suites and the test pool. We repeat Experiment 6a three times to alleviate the influence of randomness during the experiment.

We further repeat Experiment 6a except using each of ADAPT and ROBOT instead of CLOVER (named Experiments 6b and 6c, respectively).

We also repeat Experiment 4 except that we adopt cases ⑤–⑧ instead of cases ①–④ as the DL models under fuzzing (as Experiment 6d).

4.2.10 Discussion on Fuzzing Budgets. The fuzzing process on DL models with modern model architecture could be slow. The downloaded ROBOT source code specifies the size of the seed list as 1000. In the original experiment [70], ROBOT only fuzzes a DL model for a short period (5, 10, and 20 minutes) on models such as LetNet-5 on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, and SVHN and ResNet20 on CIFAR10 in the evaluation for robustness improvement delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline. In cases ① to ④, using merely 5 minutes for fuzzing, on average, ADAPT can only process 30, 30, 30, and 15 seeds, and ROBOT can only process 205, 183, 120, and 60 seeds, which correspond to only 0.03%–0.46% of the training dataset of the four cases and is insignificant. They can only generate 350, 3417, 1023, and 404 test cases (for ADAPT) and 756, 1767, 763, and 310 test cases (for ROBOT), respectively, which correspond to 0.69%–7.59% of the training datasets. Our preliminary experiment shows that such a small test suite cannot make meaningful changes in robust accuracy. We thus choose a larger time budget to cater to models with more complicated model architecture in our experiments.

Apart from setting $n_4 = 18000$, we have also attempted to set n_4 to 1800, 3600, and 7200 for Experiment 6a–6c, but the numbers of generated test cases produced by ADAPT and ROBOT are often too small to make a reasonable comparison with CLOVER. For instance, ROBOT only generates 2977 and 2772 test cases in cases ⑦ and ⑧ with $n_4 = 7200$, respectively, which are insufficient to construct test suites for $n_3 = 4000$ and $n_3 = 6000$. If $n_4 = 1800$, it generates much fewer than the number of test cases we require to construct any test suite in our data analysis (where the minimum is $n_3 = 1000$).

4.2.11 Discussion on Adversarially Trained Models as Models under Fuzzing. To train an adversarially trained model, the training scheme has used the training dataset to produce adversarial examples, where in each training epoch, a round of search for an adversarial example of a seed is conducted. Since there are many training epochs, the number of searches on each training sample is already extensive. Configuring a fuzzing technique to fuzz on the same training sample for that adversarially trained model could not meaningfully validate the robustness quality of the model. Thus, following [25, 36, 84], our experiments configure a fuzzing technique to fuzz with a test dataset of the model as the seed list. With this experimental setting, the generated test cases will be adversarial examples of the test dataset. If one trains the adversarially trained model under fuzzing with these adversarial examples, one effectively instructs the model to learn from the test dataset. So, our experiment does not retrain these adversarially trained models. Therefore, we do not measure the robust accuracy improvement achieved by a fuzzing technique on these models delivered through the testing-retraining pipeline.

We have attempted to include more adversarially trained DL models, such as the *pretrained* models provided in [8, 62] on CIFAR10 using the evolutionary neural network architecture search technique [78] combined with adversarial training, including using 50% and 100% of the samples in each mini-batch to be replaced by their adversarial examples,

to facilitate the comparison between CLOVER and the peer techniques¹⁴. However, both ROBOT and ADAPT **cannot** generate **any** test cases from the synthetic CIFAR10 model with the ratio 1.0 and the time budget of $n_4 = 18000$ seconds. We have attempted to increase the time budget n_4 further to 24 hours and increase the value of fuzzing bound ϵ by 100%, both separately and in combination. Still, both ROBOT and ADAPT cannot generate any test cases. We have profiled their executions for examination. We observed that they iterated over seeds, mutated test case candidates, and checked whether their prediction labels were adversarial as usual. On the one hand, the situation may indicate that the adversarially trained models are robust against the attacks of ROBOT and ADAPT. On the other hand, we cannot compare the results of CLOVER with them. Thus, we do not include these models in the data analysis of the present paper because we are not sure whether the inability of ROBOT and ADAPT in test case generation is due to the insufficient fuzzing budget issue or the limitation of their algorithms or any unknown factors. As a reference, CLOVER generates more than 5000 test cases on fuzzing each of these two models with $n_4=18000$.

5 RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS FOR CLOVER IN CONFIGURATION A

This section presents the results and data analysis for answering RQ 1 and RQ2 through Experiments 1 and 2 for CLOVER in Configuration A configured in the testing-retraining pipeline. We use the term CLOVER instead of the full qualification in the respective section for brevity. We also use the term *robustness improvement* achieved by CLOVER (or a peer technique, respectively) to mean the robustness improvement achieved by the retrained model output by the testing-retraining pipeline when applying CLOVER (or the peer technique, respectively) as the DL testing technique in the pipeline. The results and data analyses for RQ3–RQ4, RQ5, and RQ6 can be found in the next three sections.

5.1 Answering RQ1 (Comparison with Peer Test Suite Construction Techniques)

Fig. 8 summarizes the results of Experiment 1. It has four subfigures (a)–(d), one for each case from ① to ④. In each subfigure, the three plots from left to right correspond to the robust accuracy improvements achieved on the three selection universes $p_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$, p_{train}^{ADAPT} , and p_{train}^{ROBOT} , respectively. The five series of seven points in the five different colors in each plot corresponds to the five techniques in Experiment 1, which are depicted in the legend, from top to bottom as RANDOM, DEEPGINI, BE-ST, KM-ST, and CLOVER. In each plot, the x -axis is the number of test cases in the test suite constructed by a technique (i.e., the possible values in N_1). The y -axis is the robust accuracy improvement. A higher y value indicates a more effective technique. In Fig. 8, in total, there are 420 points representing the robust accuracy improvement results of the 420 combinations of five techniques, seven possible values for n_1 , four dataset+model cases, and three selection universes ($420 = 5 \times 7 \times 4 \times 3$).

In Fig. 8, CLOVER locates higher than RANDOM, DEEPGINI, BE-ST, and KM-ST in all 84 cases. DEEPGINI performs less effective than BE-ST and KM-ST. KM-ST performs slightly more effective than BE-ST in 72 out of 84 (86%) cases. The differences in robust accuracy improvement between CLOVER and KM-ST are as noticeable as the differences between KM-ST and DEEPGINI. The difference in case ① is smaller, and the lines for KM-ST and RANDOM cross each other and are very close.

For the Wilcoxon signed-rank test [80] at the 5% significance level with Bonferroni correction, the p -values for DEEPGINI, BE-ST, KM-ST, and CLOVER compared to RANDOM are 1.00, 1.00, 0.33, and $\leq 1e^{-5}$ on $p_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$, 1.00, 0.96, 0.98, and $\leq 1e^{-5}$ on p_{train}^{ADAPT} , and 1.00, 1.00, 0.70, and $\leq 1e^{-5}$ on p_{train}^{ROBOT} , respectively. The respective effect sizes are

¹⁴Reference [62] reports that, on CIFAR10 with ratio = 0.5 and 1.0, the best synthetic models achieve the test accuracy of 93.21% and 82.88% on the test dataset, and the robust accuracy of 48.99% and 50.60% on a set of adversarial samples generated by PGD, respectively. The architectures of the synthetic models are complicated and contain 20,435,714 and 7,705,130 parameters, respectively.







Fig. 8. Robust Accuracy Improvements Achieved by Technique in Configuration A on Selection Universes




(a) Case ① on the three selection universes in Fig. 8 (a)



(b) Case ② on the three selection universes in Fig. 8 (b)



(c) Case ③ on the three selection universes in Fig. 8 (c)



(d) Case ④ on the three selection universes in Fig. 8 (d)

Fig. 9. Robust Accuracy Improvement in Fig. 8 Relative to RANDOM as the Baseline ($x = 0$)

2.06, 1.12, 0.01, and 1.55 on $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$, 2.10, 0.45, 0.18, and 1.19 on P_{train}^{ADAPT} , and 2.42, 2.12, 0.07, and 1.08 on P_{train}^{ROBOT} . Only CLOVER and RANDOM are significantly different at the 5% significance level with a large effect size in all four cases.

KM-ST and RANDOM closely compete with each other. Fig. 9 uses RANDOM in Fig. 8 as the baseline (i.e., $x=0$) to show the relative performance among techniques. Positive and negative bars indicate a technique more effective and less effective than RANDOM, respectively. For instance, in the leftmost plot (for $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$) in Fig. 8(c), when $n_1 = 10000$, CLOVER and RANDOM are 62.49% and 51.66%, respectively, in y -values. In the leftmost plot of Fig. 9(c), the respective bar height is 10.83%.

In Fig. 9, CLOVER outperforms RANDOM in all 84 cases (100%). Almost all bars for CLOVER are longer than the others in the same plot. On average, CLOVER is more effective than RANDOM in robust accuracy improvement by 5.51%, 6.30%, 7.40%, and 3.21% in cases ① to ④, respectively. KM-ST wins RANDOM in only 39 out of 84 cases (46%) but underperforms RANDOM in the remaining 54%. The bars for KM-ST are all short (compared to the bars for CLOVER). The average change in robust accuracy improvement achieved by KM-ST atop RANDOM for the four models are 0.47%, -0.93% , -1.18% , and 0.27% only (i.e., less effective than RANDOM in two out of four cases). The differences in robust accuracy improvement between CLOVER and KM-ST are large and consistent.

BE-ST wins RANDOM in 12 cases (14% only), but the differences are all small (less than 3.79% on average). For the remaining 72 cases, most bars for BE-ST are much longer than the bars for KM-ST.

DEEPGINI always underperforms RANDOM by a large extent. It is the least effective among the techniques in 49 cases (58%), and if DEEPGINI is not the least effective one, then BE-ST or KM-ST is.

Across all four cases ① to ④, CLOVER outperforms RANDOM by 0.56%–11.39%, 2.96%–11.45%, 2.42%–18.30%, 0.91%–6.96%, respectively. Across all three selection universes, the corresponding mean differences in robust accuracy improvements achieved by CLOVER are 7.17%, 4.93%, and 4.73%.

We also conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test at the 5% significance level with Bonferroni correction on the robust accuracy improvements achieved by CLOVER compared to those achieved by each of DEEPGINI, BE-ST and KM-ST by pairing based on test suite size and selection universe. Their p -values are all $\leq 1e^{-5}$, and the effect sizes are all at a large level on $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$, P_{train}^{ADAPT} and P_{train}^{ROBOT} , meaning that CLOVER is significantly different from DEEPGINI, BE-ST and KM-ST at the 5% significance level in statistically meaningful ways.

In summary, the difference between CLOVER and RANDOM is statistically significant at the 5% significance level with a large effect size. KM-ST, BE-ST, and DEEPGINI perform either similarly to RANDOM or worse than it significantly at the 5% significance level with medium to large effect sizes.

Answering RQ1

CLOVER in Configuration A is the only technique consistently outperforming RANDOM and all other peer techniques in the experiment in a statistically meaningful way.

5.2 Answering RQ2 (Trend of Robustness Improvement)

Fig. 10 shows the result of Experiment 2. The four plots from left to right correspond to cases ① to ④, respectively. In each plot, the x -axis is the five pools of test cases with CC falling into the section indicated by the x -value accepted by CLOVER to produce test suites. These sections are the possible values of n_2 in the set N_2 (i.e., from $n_2 = [0, 0.2]$ to $n_2 = (0.8, 1]$). We refer to the five test suites as Pool-1 to Pool-5, respectively. The y -axis is the robust accuracy




Fig. 10. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by CLOVER in Configuration A on Test Suites Concentrated with Test Cases in Different Sections of CC (RANDOM as the Baseline)

improvement achieved by CLOVER. The four solid curves and dashed lines from bottom to top correspond to the four possible sizes (values in N_3) of the test suite constructed by CLOVER and RANDOM, respectively.

Across all four cases ① to ④ and all sizes of the constructed test suites (points along the curve in the same line style), as the test suite accepted by CLOVER is replaced by the one filled with samples with higher CC (i.e., as the x -value increases), CLOVER achieves an increasingly higher robust accuracy improvement. The cumulative increases in robust accuracy improvement from using Pool-1 (i.e., the test suite with the section of the lowest CC) to using Pool-5 (i.e., the test suite with the section of the highest CC) for all curves are large. For instance, when the test suite size (n_3) is 6000, these cumulative increases in cases ① to ④ are 7.98%, 21.48%, 30.74%, and 12.75%, (or 10.93%, 77.35%, 119.94%, 69.11% in percentage by normalizing the robust accuracy improvement for the one with the lowest CC ($n_2 = [0, 0.2]$) to 1) respectively. For each case from ① to ④, the mean cumulative increases in robust accuracy improvements from using Pool-1 to Pool-5 achieved by CLOVER over the five test suites are 11.02%, 14.30%, 25.46%, and 9.74%, respectively. The effect of higher CC is significant.

Across the four cases and every consecutive pair of curves in the same plot, we compare two particular points in the curve pair: The point with the highest y -value in the lower curve (referred to as configuration $D_{highest, smaller}$) and the point with the lowest y -value in the upper curve (referred to as configuration $D_{lowest, larger}$). In Fig. 10, we mark these two points in a curve pair in case ① to ease readers to follow. They represent CLOVER using Pool-5 to construct a *smaller* test suite and CLOVER using Pool-1 to construct a *larger* test suite, respectively. Interestingly, the former configuration ($D_{highest, smaller}$) even achieves a significantly higher robustness improvement than the configuration ($D_{lowest, larger}$).

- (1) From top to bottom in each plot, there are three pairs of such points. We compute the gain in robust accuracy improvement achieved by the point $D_{highest, smaller}$ on top of $D_{lowest, larger}$ in each such pair. For instance, the gain for the two points marked in case ① in Fig. 10 is 4.92% ($= 60.62\% - 55.70\%$). The mean gains of the four cases for the three pairs of points from top to bottom are 2.56%, 8.54%, 18.72%, and 6.02%, respectively.
- (2) Also, from top to down in every plot, the reductions in selection universe size for the three pairs of consecutive curves in percentage are 33.3% ($= \frac{6000-4000}{6000}$), 50.0% ($= \frac{4000-2000}{4000}$), 50.0% ($= \frac{2000-1000}{2000}$), respectively. The reductions in ratio and absolute number are large while achieving large gains in robust accuracy improvements.

Fig. 10 also shows that CLOVER consistently outperforms RANDOM of the same test suite size when using Pool-5. The overall trend is clear, moving upward by large steps in percentage, and consistent across all four cases. There are large upward increases in most curves when the x -value changes from Pool-4 to Pool-5 (i.e., from the section (0.6, 0.8] to the section (0.8, 1]). The results show that a test suite with high CC (Pool-5) can potentially outperform an observably larger test suite with low CC (Pool-1).

We further compute the change in robust accuracy improvement achieved by each test suite of CLOVER in each section (Pool-1 to Pool-5) compared to RANDOM for the same test suite size in each of the four plots. We measure Spearman’s correlation coefficient [56] between this change in robust accuracy improvement and the CC value of the corresponding test suite of CLOVER for each of the four cases. The results for cases ① to ④ are 0.94, 0.68, 0.84, and 0.93, respectively. They are all strong correlations [52].

We summarize that, under the same test case selection budget (i.e., the test suite size is the same), CLOVER is more effective than RANDOM.

Answering RQ2

CLOVER in Configuration A, when constructing test suites with higher CC (i.e., a section closer to 1), achieves a higher robust accuracy improvement. A test suite with test cases taken from Pool-5 (a high CC section) significantly outperforms (in terms of the number of test cases) both a random test suite of the same size and an observably larger test suite that contains test cases taken from Pool-1 (a low CC section) in terms of the robust accuracy improvement.

6 RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS FOR CLOVER IN CONFIGURATION B

This section presents the results and data analysis for answering RQ3 and RQ4 through Experiments 3 and 4 for CLOVER in Configuration B. Like what we have clarified in Section 5, we use the term robustness improvement achieved by a DL testing technique to mean the robustness improvement achieved by the retrained model output by the testing-retraining pipeline with the technique as the DL testing in the pipeline.

6.1 Answering RQ3 (Overall Effect of CLOVER)

Effectiveness in test case generation: Figures 11 and 12 summarize the results of Experiments 3a, 3b, and 3c on the fuzzing effectiveness in producing samples in terms of the number of unique adversarial labels ($\#AdvLabel$) and the number of unique categories ($\#Category$) as well as the mean CC values achieved by the test suites ($\#CC$). Each of the two figures consists of four radar charts for cases ①–④, respectively. We note that the values achieved by each technique in each axis in each radar chart can be found in Tables 10 and 11 in Appendix B.

In Fig. 11, each radar chart has ten radial axes, five for $\#AdvLabel$ and five for $\#Category$. The five radial axes for $\#AdvLabel$ and these for $\#Category$ starting from 12 o’clock and 6 o’clock in clock position and then clockwise, respectively, are the results for $n_3 = 1000, 2000, 4000, 6000,$ and All , respectively, where All refers to the test pool that contains all test cases generated by the technique (i.e., without selection criteria to filter test cases), with the fuzzing budget of $n_4 = 18000$ seconds. Similarly, in Fig. 12, the five axes starting from 12 o’clock in clock position and then clockwise are $\#CC$ for $n_3 = 1000, 2000, 4000, 6000,$ and All . In each radar chart, the results for ADAPT, ROBOT, and CLOVER are shown in different line styles and markers.




Fig. 11. $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$ for Different Techniques with $n_4 = 18000$ (in \log_{10} scale)




Fig. 12. $\#CC$ for Different Techniques with $n_4 = 18000$

The result of each technique shown in each radar axis in each radar chart is the result for the value of n_3 as indicated by the axis label, where we show the results in the base-10 log scale (i.e., $\log_{10}(\cdot)$) in Fig. 11. We use the base-10 log scale to show the results for the metrics $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$ because the results among the three techniques vary by *more than one order of magnitude* at some values of n_3 . For instance, the $\#Category$ values of the test suites generated with $n_3 = 6000$ and $n_4 = 18000$ for CLOVER versus ROBOT versus ADAPT in case (4) are 6000 versus 2104

versus 672, respectively, or 3.78 versus 3.32 versus 2.83 in the base-10 log scale, respectively. Besides, although, visually, the difference of 0.46 between 3.78 and 3.32 in a chart looks small, the actual difference in the original number is $3896 = 6000 - 2104$, or 185% ($=3896/2104$).

We observe that in every radar chart in the two figures except the chart for cases ① in Fig. 12, the region enclosed by the data points for CLOVER is the largest, that for ADAPT is the smallest, and that for ROBOT is in between the former two. For the remaining chart (shown in Fig. 12), the enclosed region for CLOVER is still the largest: the enclosed regions in cases ① for ROBOT is smaller than these for ADAPT. We also observe that in each chart, the difference in the region size between any two pairs of techniques appears large (note that Fig. 11 is in the log scale).

In terms of individual axes, CLOVER achieves a larger value than both ADAPT and ROBOT in each radar chart. The results indicate that in terms of $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$, CLOVER consistently outperforms ADAPT and ROBOT. As a summary of these radar charts (before taking \log_{10}), the mean $\#AdvLabel$, the mean $\#Category$, and the mean $\#CC$, each across all combinations of the four cases (①–④) and $n_3 \in N_3$ are 3250.00, 3250.00, and 0.99 for CLOVER, 1603.44, 941.38, and 0.79 for ADAPT, and 2100.63, 1931.19, and 0.82 for ROBOT, respectively.

They show that CLOVER produces test cases with much wider ranges of unique adversarial labels and unique categories by 2.03 \times and 3.45 \times compared to ADAPT and by 1.55 \times and 1.68 \times compared to ROBOT across the benchmarks on average, indicating that CLOVER can produce more diverse robustness-oriented test suites than the two state-of-the-art techniques. We observe from the data analysis that the test suites produced by CLOVER also exhibit higher mean CC values, which aligns with the higher performance in $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$ achieved by CLOVER compared to the two peer techniques.

To further compare the difference in terms of $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ between CLOVER and the other two peer techniques, we conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and calculate Cohen’s d to measure the p -value and effect size over all combinations of Cases ① to ④ and the size n_3 of the constructed test suites with $n_4 = 18000$. The p -values are all $\leq 1e^5$. The effect sizes for the test between CLOVER and ADAPT are 0.80, 1.24, and 2.41, for $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$, respectively. The effect sizes for the test between CLOVER and ROBOT are 0.64, 0.76, and 1.68, for $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$, respectively. They are all at the medium, large, and huge levels, respectively, showing that the higher effectiveness of CLOVER than both ADAPT and ROBOT in Experiment 3 is statistically meaningful in terms of the three measurement metrics with observable differences.

Effectiveness in robustness improvement: Table 3 summarizes the results of Experiments 3a, 3b, and 3c in robust accuracy improvement. It contains two sub-tables due to page size limitations. In each sub-table, from top to bottom, there are five sections. The first four sections are for cases ① to ④. The last section summarizes the statistics for the same column. The section for each case (① to ④) shows the robust accuracy improvement of a technique for the combinations of n_3 and n_4 as specified by the column headings, which is the mean result of three repeated trials. In the last section, the first three rows show the mean robust accuracy improvement achieved by ADAPT, ROBOT, and CLOVER in the four cases, respectively. The next two rows show the mean robust accuracy improvement of CLOVER to that of each of ADAPT and ROBOT in ratio, respectively. There are 16 combinations of n_3 and n_4 for each case in Table 3, so there are 64 values in total.

CLOVER achieves higher robust accuracy improvements than both ADAPT and ROBOT in all 64 combinations (100%). Taking all 64 combinations for each technique as a whole, the mean robust accuracy improvements for ADAPT, ROBOT and CLOVER are 28.33%, 32.15%, and 55.01%, respectively. In 41 out of 64 combinations (64%), CLOVER is more effective than ADAPT by at least 60% in ratio. For instance, in case ① with $n_4=1800$ and $n_3=1000$, the robust accuracy improvements of

Table 3. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by Different DL Testing Techniques in Configuration B

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_4 = 1800$				$n_4 = 3600$			
		n_3				n_3			
		1000	2000	4000	6000	1000	2000	4000	6000
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	ADAPT	31.72	35.76	38.36	40.18	35.68	38.85	45.90	46.21
	ROBOT	37.10	44.66	51.18	53.91	40.55	49.16	57.64	60.82
	CLOVER	61.12	70.86	75.06	75.13	60.26	70.76	77.85	80.05
②: SVHN+LeNet5	ADAPT	19.98	22.22	25.91	27.62	20.36	23.43	25.99	30.50
	ROBOT	20.62	23.75	28.34	32.82	20.36	23.25	29.31	34.07
	CLOVER	23.29	29.37	38.20	44.26	24.47	30.30	39.63	48.22
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	16.83	19.95	23.38	24.90	18.91	24.22	28.64	32.38
	ROBOT	16.03	20.39	28.11	32.39	17.13	23.57	33.09	39.81
	CLOVER	55.43	67.31	73.71	75.88	54.57	68.65	76.71	79.75
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	11.83	13.18	13.36	13.80	13.03	14.12	15.29	15.81
	ROBOT	12.80	14.12	15.40	16.55	14.70	16.33	19.77	20.73
	CLOVER	28.91	37.89	44.11	47.93	28.60	39.31	51.64	57.87
Mean Robust Accuracy Improvement	ADAPT	20.09	22.78	25.25	26.63	22.00	25.16	28.96	31.23
	ROBOT	21.64	25.73	30.76	33.92	23.19	28.08	34.95	38.86
	CLOVER	42.19	51.36	57.77	60.80	41.97	52.26	61.46	66.47
	CLOVER÷ADAPT	2.10	2.25	2.29	2.28	1.91	2.08	2.12	2.13
	CLOVER÷ROBOT	1.95	2.00	1.88	1.79	1.81	1.86	1.76	1.71
Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_4 = 7200$				$n_4 = 18000$			
		n_3				n_3			
		1000	2000	4000	6000	1000	2000	4000	6000
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	ADAPT	37.10	44.75	49.70	51.53	38.85	49.25	57.36	60.59
	ROBOT	39.19	52.60	63.77	68.04	43.24	53.87	65.33	71.68
	CLOVER	58.65	67.88	72.93	80.67	55.76	63.03	78.98	83.83
②: SVHN+LeNet5	ADAPT	20.58	23.18	28.65	30.70	19.53	22.56	27.50	31.34
	ROBOT	20.48	23.86	30.11	35.74	20.03	24.98	29.77	36.11
	CLOVER	24.90	31.68	41.57	47.82	23.73	29.96	42.08	50.07
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	19.85	26.73	36.06	40.73	19.71	29.61	43.94	50.72
	ROBOT	17.94	23.03	35.66	44.19	18.91	26.12	37.93	48.21
	CLOVER	54.83	68.29	77.59	81.31	54.45	68.99	77.51	81.22
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	13.96	15.61	17.84	18.29	15.12	17.90	21.48	24.38
	ROBOT	15.73	18.78	23.23	24.86	16.57	20.68	27.20	31.59
	CLOVER	27.71	39.09	53.53	61.10	27.34	39.05	54.75	62.98
Mean Robust Accuracy Improvement	ADAPT	22.87	27.57	33.06	35.32	23.30	29.83	37.57	41.76
	ROBOT	23.34	29.57	38.19	43.21	24.69	31.41	40.06	46.90
	CLOVER	41.52	51.73	61.41	67.73	40.32	50.26	63.33	69.53
	CLOVER÷ADAPT	1.82	1.88	1.86	1.92	1.73	1.68	1.69	1.67
	CLOVER÷ROBOT	1.78	1.75	1.61	1.57	1.63	1.60	1.58	1.48

CLOVER and ADAPT are 61.12 and 31.72, respectively. The improvement ratio is $(61.12 - 31.72)/31.72 = 92\%$. Compared to ROBOT, in 51 out of 64 cases (80%), CLOVER is more effective by at least 30%. Across these 64 combinations of n_3 and n_4 , CLOVER is more effective than ADAPT and ROBOT up to 266% and 246%, respectively. The largest differences between CLOVER and each of ADAPT and ROBOT appear in case ④ with $n_4=3600$ and $n_3=6000$ and case ③ with $n_4=1800$ and




Fig. 13. CC Values of Test Cases Generated by CLOVER in Configuration B

$n_3=1000$, respectively. Across the 16 combinations of n_4 and n_3 , in terms of mean robust accuracy improvement ratio, on average, CLOVER is more effective than ADAPT and ROBOT by 67% to 129% and 48% to 100%, respectively.

The table also shows that if n_3 is relatively small (e.g., $n_3 = 1000$), increasing the time budget n_4 from 1800 to 18000 has little (and sometimes negative) effect on the robustness improvement on these four models achieved by CLOVER. On the other hand, when n_3 is relatively large (e.g., $n_3 = 6000$), the robustness improvement becomes more obvious and always positive by increasing the fuzzing budget. The result shows that using a longer time budget (i.e., a higher cost) does not warrant getting a higher robustness improvement (i.e., a higher effectiveness) if the constructed test suite could be small. However, suppose the constructed test suite size is affordable to be relatively large. In that case, spending more time on fuzzing the DL models can generally make the pipeline produce retrained DL models with higher robustness improvement.

We compute the CC value of each test case generated by CLOVER with the fuzzing budget of 18000 seconds on each pair of the model under test and the respective retrained model. Fig. 13 shows the CC values of all generated test cases corresponding to models retrained with different test suite sizes (containing 1000 to 6000 test cases, indicated by the legends “Retrain with 1000” to “Retrain with 6000”, respectively), where the x -axis shows the test cases in the corresponding test suite sorted in the ascending order of CC value. The y -axis is the CC value of the corresponding test case.

We observe a clear and large reduction in CC achieved by CLOVER in each plot in the figure. We conduct the Mann-Whitney U test and calculate Cohen’s d to measure the p -value and effect size between each such pair of CC value sequences achieved by the same test suite. The p -values are all smaller than $1e^{-5}$, indicating they are all significantly different at the 5% significance level with Bonferroni correction. The effect sizes corresponding to the legends of the figure from left to right are: case ①: 0.29, 0.35, 0.53, 0.62; case ②: 0.63, 0.85, 0.80, 0.87; case ③: 0.21, 0.46, 0.81, 0.93; and case ④: 0.62, 0.77, 0.90, 0.98, respectively. The effect sizes in 12 out of these 16 cases (75%) are medium or large with four small effect sizes (in case ① and ③ for $n_3 = 1000$ and $n_3 = 2000$). The result shows that the reduction achieved by CLOVER is statistically meaningful.

For each such set of test cases, we further compute the increment of robust accuracy improvement (denoted by I_{acc}) and the decrement of mean CC (denoted by D_{cc}) achieved on this set of test cases after retraining the model under test with the constructed test suite. In each case, we measure the Spearman’s correlation coefficient [56] between I_{acc}

and D_{cc} on the set of all test cases generated by CLOVER. The results for cases ① to ④ are 1.00, 0.80, 1.00, and 1.00, respectively. They are all strong correlations [52].

We recall that FGSM/PGD and two fuzzing techniques were used to generate the selection universes in Experiment 1. In contrast, the test suites in Experiment 3 are generated by CLOVER in Configuration B. We compare each of RANDOM and CLOVER in Experiment 1 with CLOVER in Experiment 3 to study the effect of using the fuzzing and selection components of CLOVER and that of using only the fuzzing component of CLOVER, respectively.

We also recall that the mean robust accuracy improvements of RANDOM and CLOVER in Experiment 1 are 34.88% and 41.09%, respectively, and that of CLOVER in Experiment 3 is 55.01%, where the differences are large. To further compare the robust accuracy improvement between CLOVER in Experiments 1 and 3 and between RANDOM in Experiment 1 and CLOVER in Experiment 3, we conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test (paired by test suite size) and calculate Cohen’s d to measure the p -value and effect size over all combinations of Cases ① to ④ and the size n_3 of the constructed test suites. The p -values are both $\leq 1e^{-5}$, and the effect sizes are large (i.e., 0.87 and 0.79 in the two comparisons, respectively). The result shows that the higher effectiveness of CLOVER in Experiment 3 than both RANDOM and CLOVER in Experiment 1 is statistically meaningful.

Answering RQ3

CLOVER outperforms the current state-of-the-art coverage-based and loss-based techniques (ADAPT and ROBOT) in generating more diverse test suites by 2.03 \times and 1.55 \times regarding the number of unique adversarial labels, and by 3.45 \times and 1.68 \times regarding the number of unique categories, respectively. CLOVER achieves higher mean CC values than ADAPT and ROBOT by 26% and 20%, respectively. It also outperforms ADAPT and ROBOT in generating test suites for robust accuracy improvements by 67%–129% and 48%–100%, respectively. In addition, CLOVER achieves a strong correlation of 0.80–1.00 between the increment of robust accuracy improvement and the decrement of mean CC of its generated test cases in Spearman’s correlation coefficient.

6.2 Answering RQ4 (Effects of CLOVER Variants)

Effectiveness in test case generation: Figures 14 and 15 summarize the results of Experiment 4a and 4b measured in $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ for CLOVER and its two variants, i.e., CLOVER+GINI, and CLOVER+FOL. Readers can interpret the axes of the charts in these two figures like these in Figures 11 and 12, respectively. We also copy CLOVER’s results from Figures 11 and 12 to ease the comparison between Experiments 3 and 4.

We observe that the enclosed regions for CLOVER are either the largest or almost completely overlapping with the largest regions in the two charts for cases ③ and ④ in Fig. 14. The regions enclosed by the data points for CLOVER+FOL are always the smallest in Fig. 14, and smaller than or close to these for CLOVER in Fig. 15. Moreover, in Fig. 15, the regions for CLOVER+GINI are much smaller than those for the other two techniques. The axes for $n_3=All$ in the four charts in Fig. 15 further show that CLOVER+GINI achieves similar $\#CC$ values compared to CLOVER or larger than CLOVER a bit, but its values are much smaller than CLOVER with $n_3 \in \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000\}$. The result indicates that the test case prioritization metric Gini is effective in guiding test case generation with higher CC values but quite ineffective in selecting those with higher CC values, which is consistent with the results of robust accuracy improvement we observed in Experiment 1 (see Section 5.1).

As a summary of the results presented in these radar charts (before taking a \log operation), the mean $\#AdvLabel$, the mean $\#Category$, and the mean $\#CC$, each across all combinations of cases ①–④ and $n_3 \in N_3$ are 3250.00, 3250.00,




Fig. 14. #AdvLabel and #Category for CLOVER and its Variants (in \log_{10} scale)

and 0.99 for CLOVER, 2630.44, 2449.88, and 0.36 for CLOVER+GINI, and 2069.44, 1954.88, and 0.88 for CLOVER+FOL, respectively. CLOVER produces test suites with wider ranges of unique adversarial labels and unique categories by 1.24 \times and 1.33 \times compared to CLOVER+GINI and by 1.57 \times and 1.66 \times compared to CLOVER+FOL across the benchmarks on average. Comparing the results of CLOVER's two variants with the results of ADAPT and ROBOT presented in answering RQ3 (see Section 6.1), both CLOVER+GINI and CLOVER+FOL outperform ADAPT and ROBOT in terms of #AdvLabel, #Category, and #CC except #CC for CLOVER+GINI.

Effectiveness in robustness improvement: Table 4 summarizes the results of Experiments 4a and 4b in robust accuracy improvement. In the table, there are five sections from top to bottom. The first four sections are for cases ① to ④, and the last section summarizes the statistics for the same column. For cases ① to ④, the corresponding section presents the robust accuracy improvement of a technique in the experimental setting of n_3 (values in N_3) specified by the column heading with the time budget of 18000 seconds. In the last section, the first three rows show the mean robust accuracy improvement achieved by the original CLOVER, CLOVER+GINI, and CLOVER+FOL in the four cases, respectively. The next two rows show the mean robust accuracy improvement of CLOVER compared to each of CLOVER+GINI and CLOVER+FOL in ratio.




Fig. 15. #CC for CLOVER and its Variants

Table 4. Robust Accuracy Improvements Achieved by CLOVER Variants in Configuration B

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_4 = 18000$			
		n_3			
		1000	2000	4000	6000
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	CLOVER	55.76	63.03	78.98	83.83
	CLOVER+GINI	37.01	43.27	50.79	56.73
	CLOVER+FOL	49.35	59.03	73.09	80.05
②: SVHN+LeNet5	CLOVER	23.73	29.96	42.08	50.07
	CLOVER+GINI	17.67	20.23	24.68	28.03
	CLOVER+FOL	20.64	25.28	31.51	36.37
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	54.45	68.99	77.51	81.22
	CLOVER+GINI	16.62	21.32	33.68	46.24
	CLOVER+FOL	39.77	54.33	68.37	72.83
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	27.34	39.05	54.75	62.98
	CLOVER+GINI	16.12	24.68	34.85	41.95
	CLOVER+FOL	20.25	26.55	35.30	40.76
Mean Robust Accuracy Improvement	CLOVER	40.32	50.26	63.33	69.53
	CLOVER+GINI	21.86	27.38	36.00	43.24
	CLOVER+FOL	32.50	41.30	52.07	57.50
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER+GINI})$	1.84	1.84	1.76	1.61
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER+FOL})$	1.24	1.22	1.22	1.21

From cases ① to ④, we observe the original CLOVER achieves higher robust accuracy improvements than the two variants CLOVER+GINI and CLOVER+FOL in all 16 combinations consistently. Across all four cases, the mean robust accuracy improvements for the original CLOVER, CLOVER+GINI, and CLOVER+FOL over the 16 combinations are 55.86%, 32.12%, and 45.84%, respectively. Across all values of n_3 , in terms of mean robust accuracy improvement ratio, the original CLOVER is significantly more effective than CLOVER+GINI by 61%–84%, which is consistent with the large difference of #CC value between CLOVER and CLOVER+GINI in Fig. 15 for answering RQ4.

For each case from ① to ④, CLOVER+FOL in Table 4 and ROBOT in Table 3 with $n_4=18000$ are the results with the same fuzzing time budget of 18000 seconds. The mean differences in robust accuracy improvement between them (computed as CLOVER+FOL minus ROBOT) are 7.81%, 9.89%, 12.01%, and 10.60% for the four cases. They are all positive, and their underlying values before taking the average are also all positive. The result shows that the algorithm of CLOVER is more effective than that of ROBOT when using the same FOL metric to guide their fuzzing processes.

Table 5. Robust Accuracy Improvements Achieved by CLOVER and Its Variants

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_4 = 18000$			
		n_3			
		1000	2000	4000	6000
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	CLOVER	55.76	63.03	78.98	83.83
	CLOVER+SMALLEST	41.81	47.37	57.63	64.80
	CLOVER+SINGLEDIR	52.60	60.27	71.24	75.52
②: SVHN+LeNet5	CLOVER	23.73	29.96	42.08	50.07
	CLOVER+SMALLEST	19.81	24.19	28.07	33.77
	CLOVER+SINGLEDIR	22.47	26.38	33.21	38.87
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	54.45	68.99	77.51	81.22
	CLOVER+SMALLEST	17.18	22.04	32.86	45.52
	CLOVER+SINGLEDIR	52.93	64.90	75.86	78.93
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	27.34	39.05	54.75	62.98
	CLOVER+SMALLEST	16.64	23.68	34.10	44.93
	CLOVER+SINGLEDIR	24.56	35.06	48.85	59.75
Mean Robust Accuracy Improvement	CLOVER	40.32	50.26	63.33	69.53
	CLOVER+SMALLEST	23.86	29.32	38.17	47.26
	CLOVER+SINGLEDIR	38.14	46.65	57.29	63.27
	$\frac{((\text{CLOVER+SMALLEST}) - \text{CLOVER})}{\text{CLOVER}}$	-41%	-42%	-40%	-32%
	$\frac{((\text{CLOVER+SINGLEDIR}) - \text{CLOVER})}{\text{CLOVER}}$	-5%	-7%	-10%	-9%

Moreover, if the guiding metric is changed from FOL to CC, CLOVER further enlarges the difference. Specifically, across all values of n_3 , in terms of mean robust accuracy improvement ratio, the original CLOVER is more effective than CLOVER+FOL and ROBOT, by 21%–24% and 48%–63%, respectively.

Answering RQ4

CLOVER in Configuration B is more effective in both test case generation and robustness improvement than its variant configured with Gini or FOL as the guiding metric. The two variants of CLOVER are also more effective than ADAPT and ROBOT.

7 RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS FOR KEY DESIGN DECISION IN CLOVER

This section reports the data analysis for answering RQ5.

7.1 Major Design Decisions

Table 5 summarizes the results of Experiments 5a–5b. We copy CLOVER’s results from Table 3 to this table to ease the comparison. It has five sections from top to bottom, one section for a case in cases ① to ④, and the last section for the comparison statistics. The first four sections show the robust accuracy improvements achieved by CLOVER, CLOVER+SMALLEST, and CLOVER+SINGLEDIR. There are 4 combinations of n_3 and n_4 for each case and 16 combinations in total. Like the previous two sections, the robustness improvement refers to the robustness improvement exhibited by the retrained model output by the testing-retraining pipeline configured with CLOVER or its variants.

7.1.1 The smaller CC, the more effective? In all 16 combinations of n_3 and n_4 for cases ① to ④ presented in Table 5, CLOVER+SMALLEST achieves smaller robust accuracy improvements compared with CLOVER. Their average robust accuracy improvements are 55.86% and 34.65%, respectively. The difference is large, and the direction of change is consistent.

We measure the reduction ratio in robust accuracy improvement for each combination of n_3 and n_4 for CLOVER+SMALLEST compared to CLOVER. For example, in case ① with $n_3 = 1000$ and $n_4 = 18000$, ratio is $(55.76 - 41.81)/55.76 = 25\%$. For cases ① to ④, the ranges of the reduction ratios are 23%–27%, 17%–33%, 44%–68%, and 29%–39%, respectively, with an average of 39%.

If designing CLOVER to use a smaller CC value for selecting test cases, the above result shows that the reduction ratio of mean robust accuracy improvement is consistent, large, and observable, indicating that configuring CLOVER to favor higher CC values when selecting test cases is a more effective strategy. Compared to the results in Table 3, we note that CLOVER+SMALLEST still achieves 69% and 25% cases with higher robust accuracy improvement than ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively.

Recall from the main result of Experiment 2 that test suites containing test cases with higher CC values are more effective than those with lower CC values. The two experiments (Experiment 2 and Experiment 5a) consistently show that configuring CLOVER to prefer test cases with higher CC values in test suite construction produces greater robust accuracy improvements than configuring it to prefer test cases with lower CC values.

7.1.2 More effective to fuzz each seed using a single direction? In all 16 combinations in Table 5, CLOVER outperforms CLOVER+SINGLEDIR in the robust accuracy improvement. The average robust accuracy improvement of CLOVER+SINGLEDIR is 51.34%, and the average reduction ratio in robust accuracy improvement is 8%. From cases ① to ④, the ranges of the reduction ratios are 4%–10%, 5%–22%, 2%–6%, and 5%–11%, respectively.

After factoring out the perturbations due to adding β -AFOs to each seed in line 4 of Algorithm 3, the drops in mean robust accuracy improvement are observable and consistent in direction. It shows that configuring CLOVER to fuzz seeds with β -AFOs is more effective.

In the table, the robust accuracy improvement of CLOVER+SINGLEDIR is generally higher than that of CLOVER+SMALLEST. In some extreme cases, such as $n_3 = 4000$ and $n_4 = 18000$ on case ③, the difference is 43.00 ($= 75.86 - 32.86$). The result shows that the effect of preferring smaller CC exerts a larger effect on CLOVER to push down the effectiveness of the generated test suites.

7.2 Hyperparameters to Control Fuzzing Attempts

Figures 16–20 summarize the results of Experiments 5c–5g, where CLOVER is configured with different values of m , k , δ , ϵ , and p -norm, respectively. Each figure has four sections, one section for each of cases ①–④. In each section, the x -axis is n_3 , and the y -axis is the robust accuracy improvement. To ease the comparison between Experiments 3 and 5, we copy the results of the original CLOVER from Table 3 and show them as the solid bars in each figure. The results for the other settings are shown in the bars filled with different patterns corresponding to the legend.

In Fig. 16 (for varying m), in all 16 combinations of n_3 and n_4 for cases ① to ④, CLOVER configured with different values of m achieve quite similar robust accuracy improvements. Across all four cases, the differences in robust accuracy improvements between the original CLOVER (with $m = 5$) and the other variants, i.e., CLOVER with $m = 3$, $m = 7$, and $k = 9$ are -3% to 1% , -3% to 0% , and 4% to 1% in ratio (where we scale the original CLOVER to 1), respectively.




Fig. 16. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by CLOVER Configured with Various Values of m




Fig. 17. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by CLOVER Configured with Various Values of k




Fig. 18. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by CLOVER Configured with Various Values of δ

Similarly, in Fig. 17 (for varying k), the robust accuracy improvements among the CLOVER variants are similar. Compared to the original CLOVER (with $k = 20$), the differences range from -2% to 1% , -3% to 1% , and -3% to 2% in ratio (where the original CLOVER is scaled to 1), respectively, for $k = 5$, $k = 10$, and $k = 40$, respectively, which are also small.




Fig. 19. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by CLOVER Configured with Different Types of p -norm




Fig. 20. Robust Accuracy Improvement Achieved by CLOVER Configured with Various Values of ϵ

In Fig. 18 (for varying δ), different CLOVER variants achieve similar robust accuracy improvements: The differences against the original CLOVER (which is scaled to 1) are -2% to 2%, -2% to 4%, and -2% to 0% in ratio for $\delta = 0.001, 0.005,$ and $0.05,$ respectively, which are also small.

In Fig. 19 (for varying the p -norm), the differences in robust accuracy improvement between the original CLOVER and the variant range from -0.01% to 0%, which is small.

In summary, we observe that the above hyperparameters do not significantly affect the performance of the CLOVER algorithm.

Fig. 20 summarizes the results for Experiment 5g. In all 16 combinations of n_3 and n_4 , As expected, by using different fuzzing bounds (values for ϵ), CLOVER achieves different robust accuracy improvements. Across all four cases, the differences in robust accuracy improvements between CLOVER's variants, i.e., CLOVER with $\epsilon = 0.01, \epsilon = 0.03,$ and $\epsilon = 0.07,$ and the original CLOVER range from -51% to -46%, -14% to 6%, and 0% to 12% in ratio, respectively.

In summary, the robust accuracy improvement is noticeably affected by the changes in ϵ but not by the other studied hyperparameters. It is interesting to explore the underlying reasons as a future work.




Fig. 21. #AdvLabel and #Category for Different Techniques on Adversarially Trained Models with $n_4 = 18000$ (in \log_{10} scale)

Answering RQ5

Configuring CLOVER with the preferences of test cases with higher CC values and enabling the use of β -AFOs in producing test cases improves the effectiveness of CLOVER. Varying the key hyperparameters (m , k , δ , and p -norm) in the algorithm does not significantly affect CLOVER's performance. But, using different fuzzing bounds (ϵ), as expected, affects its performance.

8 RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS FOR OVERALL EFFECT OF CLOVER ON ADVERSARIALLY TRAINED MODELS

This section presents the result and data analysis for answering RQ6 through Experiment 6 on fuzzing adversarially trained models for CLOVER in Configuration B.

8.1 Answering RQ6 (Effects of CLOVER)

Figures 21 and 22 summarize the results of Experiment 6a–6c in terms of #AdvLabel, #Category, and #CC for CLOVER and the two peer techniques ADAPT and RobOT on adversarially trained models. Readers can interpret the axes of the




Fig. 22. #CC for Different Techniques on Adversarially Trained Models with $n_4 = 18000$

charts in these two figures like these in Fig. 11 and 12, respectively. The detailed values achieved by each technique in each axis can be found in Tables 6 and 7.

In Fig. 21, we observe that the enclosed regions for CLOVER are always larger than these of ADAPT and ROBOT in all four charts by large extents, where ROBOT always achieves the smallest regions and ADAPT is in between CLOVER and ROBOT.

Let us first discuss the results on $\#AdvLabel$. Across the axes for different $n_3 \in \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000\}$, the difference in terms of $\#AdvLabel$ between CLOVER and each of ADAPT and ROBOT tends to increase as n_3 increases. Over these four charts, when $n_3 = 1000$, the mean numbers of unique adversarial labels generated by CLOVER are $1.72\times$ and $3.98\times$ folds of these of ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively. The corresponding differences increase to $4.41\times$ and $14.69\times$ when $n_3 = 6000$, respectively.

When $n_3 = 1000$, in cases ⑤ and ⑥, where the *Ratio* parameters are set to 0.5 and 1.0 for the two CIFAR10 models (see Table 2) respectively, the mean numbers of unique adversarial labels generated by CLOVER are $1.59\times$ and $1.69\times$ of those of ADAPT, respectively, and $2.76\times$ and $3.40\times$ of those of ROBOT. The corresponding differences increase to $4.69\times$ and $9.90\times$ (for using 0.5 as the *Ratio* parameter), and $4.16\times$ and $12.19\times$ (for using 1 as the *Ratio* parameter) when $n_3 = 6000$ for ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively.

Similarly, on the two CIFAR100 models in cases ⑦ and ⑧, the corresponding differences increase from $1.71\times$ and $1.95\times$ when $n_3 = 1000$ to $4.17\times$ and $4.36\times$ when $n_3 = 6000$ for ADAPT, and increase from $5.00\times$ and $6.76\times$ when $n_3 = 1000$ to $21.02\times$ and $25.27\times$ when $n_3 = 6000$ for ROBOT, respectively.

ROBOT's performance in terms of $\#AdvLabel$ decreases significantly as the abovementioned *Ratio* parameter for adversarial example generation in each training epoch increases from 0.5 to 1. This is because, in cases ⑥ and ⑧, ROBOT generates much fewer test cases (see Table 9). ADAPT's performance also decreases but more moderately. From Table 9, we observe that ADAPT has generated much more test cases than the largest number of selected test cases ($n_3 = 6000$) in cases ⑥ and ⑧ by $5.00\times$ to $11.42\times$ already, but ROBOT only generates test cases by $1.18\times$ to $3.20\times$.

Across cases ⑤–⑧, comparing the values for the axes for $n_3 = 6000$ and $n_3 = All$ (i.e., without selection), the corresponding increases in $\#AdvLabel$ is relatively gentle, i.e., $1.43\times$, $1.05\times$, and $1.02\times$ for ADAPT, ROBOT and CLOVER, respectively. We observe that their corresponding pairs of values at $n_3 = 6000$ and $n_3 = All$ are similar between the same model with different parameter values for *Ratio*. We also observe that the total numbers of unique adversarial labels generated by ROBOT and ADAPT at $n_3 = All$ are smaller than those generated by CLOVER at $n_3 = 2000$ and $n_3 = 4000$ in all four charts, respectively.

Table 6. Mean Results of Test Suites Generated by Different DL Testing Techniques Fuzzing in Configuration *B* on Adversarially Trained Models for 3 Runs with N_3 and $n_4 = 18000$

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 1000$			$n_3 = 2000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	629	593	0.64	883	786	0.64
	ROBOT	362	329	0.74	466	425	0.73
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.91	2000	2000	0.85
⑥: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	592	552	0.54	826	726	0.54
	ROBOT	294	286	0.66	343	329	0.65
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.79	2000	2000	0.69
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	584	471	0.47	835	563	0.45
	ROBOT	200	170	0.62	224	191	0.62
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.82	2000	2000	0.71
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	514	415	0.36	697	490	0.35
	ROBOT	148	125	0.48	161	132	0.48
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.68	2000	2000	0.56
Mean Results	ADAPT	579.75	507.67	0.50	810.17	641.33	0.49
	ROBOT	251.00	227.42	0.63	298.75	269.17	0.62
	CLOVER	1000.00	1000.00	0.80	2000.00	2000.00	0.70
	CLOVER÷(ADAPT)	1.72	1.97	1.59	2.47	3.12	1.42
	CLOVER÷(ROBOT)	3.98	4.40	1.28	6.69	7.43	1.14
Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 4000$			$n_3 = 6000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	1085	895	0.64	1193	943	0.64
	ROBOT	528	467	0.72	565	480	0.72
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.72	5595	5550	0.66
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	1004	826	0.54	1096	860	0.53
	ROBOT	367	348	0.65	374	354	0.64
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.56	4560	4431	0.56
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	1101	616	0.45	1251	630	0.44
	ROBOT	243	187	0.60	248	187	0.60
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.57	5213	4911	0.53
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	868	525	0.36	973	547	0.36
	ROBOT	167	134	0.48	168	134	0.48
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.44	4245	4245	0.42
Mean Results	ADAPT	1014.50	715.58	0.49	1128.00	745.00	0.49
	ROBOT	346.42	283.83	0.61	338.58	288.42	0.61
	CLOVER	4000.00	4000.00	0.57	4973.42	4784.58	0.54
	CLOVER÷(ADAPT)	3.94	5.59	1.16	4.41	6.42	1.10
	CLOVER÷(ROBOT)	12.25	14.09	0.94	14.69	16.59	0.89

Overall, the results show that CLOVER has a higher performance in generating test cases with higher diversity in unique adversarial labels than the two peer techniques.

We next discuss the results on #Category in Fig. 21. Similar to the results of #Advlabel discussed above, we observe noticeable differences in #Category among ADAPT, ROBOT and CLOVER, and their trends of difference are almost the

Table 7. Mean Results of *All* Test Cases Generated by Different Techniques Fuzzing on Adversarially Trained Models in Configuration *B* for 3 Runs with $n_4 = 18000$

Benchmark Case	Technique	<i>All</i>		
		<i>#AdvLabel</i>	<i>#Category</i>	<i>#CC</i>
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	1677	1062	0.64
	ROBOT	623	484	0.71
	CLOVER	5627	5550	0.59
⑥: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	1405	960	0.53
	ROBOT	382	368	0.62
	CLOVER	4624	4431	0.49
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	2012	683	0.45
	ROBOT	252	187	0.60
	CLOVER	5375	4911	0.49
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	1362	599	0.36
	ROBOT	170	134	0.48
	CLOVER	4646	4245	0.40
Mean Results	ADAPT	3.14	5.79	0.49
	ROBOT	356.83	293.00	0.60
	CLOVER	5067.92	4784.58	0.49
	CLOVER÷ADAPT	3.14	5.79	0.99
	CLOVER÷ROBOT	14.20	16.33	0.81

same as the trends of difference we have discussed on *#AdvLabel* above from $n_3 = 1000$ to $n_3 = 6000$ and from $n_3 = 6000$ to $n_3 = All$.

When $n_3 = 1000$, the mean *#Category* for CLOVER is $1.97\times$ and $4.40\times$ of these of ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively. The corresponding differences increase to $6.42\times$ and $16.59\times$ when $n_3 = 6000$, respectively. When $n_3 = 1000$, in cases ⑤ and ⑥, at the *Ratio* parameter set to 0.5 and 1.0 for the two CIFAR10 models, the mean *#Category* for CLOVER are $1.68\times$ and $1.81\times$ of those of ADAPT, respectively, and $5.89\times$ and $5.15\times$ of these of ROBOT, respectively. The corresponding differences increase to $3.04\times$ and $3.50\times$ (for *Ratio* = 0.5), and $11.56\times$ and $12.84\times$ (for *Ratio* = 1) when $n_3 = 6000$ for ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively. Similarly, for the two CIFAR100 models in cases ⑦ and ⑧, the corresponding differences increase from $2.12\times$ and $2.41\times$ when $n_3 = 1000$ to $7.80\times$ and $7.76\times$ when $n_3 = 6000$ for ADAPT, and increase from $5.24\times$ and $8.00\times$ when $n_3 = 1000$ to $26.26\times$ and $31.68\times$ when $n_3 = 6000$ for ROBOT, respectively.

Fig. 22 shows the results of *#CC*. The enclosed regions for CLOVER are the largest, followed by ROBOT and finally ADAPT. We also observe that ROBOT produces higher *#CC* values than CLOVER at some n_3 , nonetheless as we have presented above, ROBOT generates an order of magnitude smaller numbers of unique adversarial labels and unique categories than CLOVER. We observe that as n_3 increases, *#CC* of CLOVER decreases gradually. The results indicate that CLOVER has to include test cases with lower CC values in the constructing test suites. This is because the CLOVER algorithm iteratively over seeds to select their test cases that have been prioritized in descending order of CC values. It further indicates that CLOVER has not generated test cases with high CC values from some test cases within the given time budget of $n_4 = 18000$. We recall that CLOVER generates test cases from the same seed with increasingly higher CC values with the aim of test case diversity through seed equivalence. Future work of CLOVER is to improve its cost-effectiveness by allocating a higher time budget to these seeds that have shown a potential to produce test cases yet with relatively low CC values.




Fig. 23. $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$ for CLOVER and Its Variants on Adversarially Trained Models with $n_4 = 18000$ (in \log_{10} scale)

To further compare the difference in terms of $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$ between CLOVER and the other two peer techniques on adversarially trained models, we conduct the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and calculate Cohen’s d to measure the p -value and effect size over all combinations of Cases ⑤ to ⑧ and the size n_3 of the constructed test suites with $n_4 = 18000$. The p -values are all $\leq 1e^{-5}$. The effect sizes for the test between CLOER and ADAPT are 1.97 and 2.34 for $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$, respectively. The effect sizes for the test between CLOER and ROBOT are 2.62 and 2.72 for $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$, respectively. They are all at huge levels, showing that the differences we have presented above are statistically meaningful in these two metrics.

8.2 Answering RQ6 (Effects of CLOVER Variants)

Fig. 23 and 24 summarize the results of Experiment 6d in $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$ and $\#CC$ for CLOVER and its two variants, i.e., CLOVER+GINI and CLOVER+FOL. Readers can interpret the axes of the charts in these two figures like these in Fig. 11 and 12, respectively. We also copy CLOVER’s results from Figures 21 and 22 to ease the comparison between Experiments 6a–6c and 6d. We note that the values achieved by CLOVER’s variants in each axis in each radar chart can be found in Table 14 and 15 in Appendix B.




Fig. 24. #CC for CLOVER and Its Variants on Adversarially Trained Models with $n_4 = 18000$

From Fig. 23, we observe that the regions enclosed by the data points of CLOVER are always the largest in all four charts. The enclosed regions for CLOVER+GINI are always the smallest, and that for CLOVER+FOL is always in between the former two.

At each of the axes of $n_3=1000, 2000, 4000,$ and 6000 , CLOVER+FOL achieves a smaller value than CLOVER in each of $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$. Specifically, for cases ⑤ to ⑧, in terms of $\#AdvLabel$, CLOVER+FOL produces fewer unique adversarial labels than the original CLOVER by 102, 126, 127, and 150 for $n_3 = 1000$, by 368, 477, 490, and 553 for $n_3 = 2000$, by 1370, 1576, 1569, and 1798 for $n_3 = 4000$, and by 2262, 1660, 2240, and 1835 for $n_3 = 6000$, respectively. The differences are large. In terms of $\#Category$, their differences are similar to those in $\#AdvLabel$. Readers may refer to Table 14 for the details. On average, in terms of $\#CC$, CLOVER is $1.61\times, 1.40\times, 1.14\times,$ and $1.36\times$ of CLOVER+FOL. At the axes for $n_3 = All$ in the eight charts in Figures 23 and 24, CLOVER+FOL produces 339, 335, 510, and 564 fewer unique adversarial labels in terms of $\#AdvLabel$ and 477, 323, 378, and 398 fewer unique categories in terms of $\#Category$ for cases ⑤–⑧, respectively; the mean $\#CC$ values of CLOVER and CLOVER+FOL are similar. CLOVER+GINI produces an order of magnitude fewer unique adversarial labels in $\#AdvLabel$ and fewer unique categories in $\#Category$ for the four cases ⑤–⑧. Its CC values are also lower than that of CLOVER by a large extent. The result indicates that both variants are less effective than CLOVER in constructing test suites to a large extent in terms of test case diversity.

The mean $\#AdvLabel$, the mean $\#Category$, and the mean $\#CC$, each across all combinations of the four cases (⑤–⑧) and $n_3 \in \{1000, 2000, 4000, 6000\}$ are 2993.35, 2946.15, and 0.65 for CLOVER, 283.25, 231.19, and 0.17 for CLOVER+GINI, and 1949.38, 1868.94, and 0.50 for CLOVER+FOL, respectively. They indicate that CLOVER produces test cases with wider ranges of unique adversarial labels and unique categories by $10.57\times$ and $12.74\times$ compared to CLOVER+GINI and by $1.54\times$ and $1.58\times$ compared to CLOVER+FOL across the benchmarks on average. Comparing the results of CLOVER's two variants with the results of ADAPT and ROBOT presented in Section 8.1, CLOVER+FOL also outperforms each of ADAPT and ROBOT in $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$.

Answering RQ6

CLOVER in Configuration B outperforms ADAPT and ROBOT on fuzzing adversarially trained models in terms of the numbers of unique adversarial labels and unique categories by $1.72\times$ – $4.41\times$ and $1.97\times$ – $6.42\times$ for ADAPT, and $3.98\times$ – $14.69\times$ and $4.40\times$ – $16.59\times$ for ROBOT, respectively. CLOVER is more effective in test case generation on fuzzing adversarially trained models than its variant configured with Gini or FOL as the guided metric. The variant of CLOVER with FOL is also more effective than ADAPT and ROBOT in terms of $\#AdvLabel$ and $\#Category$.

Table 8. Mean Test Accuracy of Retrained Models Generated by Different Techniques

Benchmark Case	Test Accuracy						
	Configuration A				Configuration B		
	DeepGini	BE-ST	KM-ST	CLOVER	ADAPT	ROBOT	CLOVER
Case ①: FashionMnist+VGG16	93.61	93.62	93.66	93.66	93.56	93.59	93.60
Case ②: SVHN+LeNet5	89.28	88.87	89.27	89.09	89.40	89.24	89.53
Case ③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	87.52	87.48	87.58	87.60	87.53	87.77	87.56
Case ④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	60.99	60.70	60.78	61.04	60.57	60.51	60.59

9 THREATS TO VALIDITY

Threats to Internal Validity: We adopt the original implementations of ADAPT and ROBOT and port them to our framework. The implementation of CLOVER is developed on top of the implementation of ROBOT straightforwardly. Our test framework, the original implementations [4, 5] of ADAPT and ROBOT, and the tools to create and run these implementations may contain bugs. We have carefully tested our framework and inspected the code. The experiment uses representative datasets [33, 48, 81], model architectures [28, 35, 61], attackers [24, 45], and top-1 accuracy, which existing experiments for DL testing, maintenance, and robustness improvement [15, 49, 70, 83, 84] widely use them to create the models under test and generate test cases from them. The hyperparameter values are typical for these models, datasets, and attack techniques. We follow [36] and [70] to specify the parameters used by ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively. If there is still any unclear part, we follow their original implementations [4, 5].

Table 8 shows the mean test accuracy of the retrained models produced by DEEPGINI, BE-ST, KM-ST and CLOVER reported in Fig. 8, and produced by ADAPT, ROBOT and CLOVER reported in Table 3. Each mean test accuracy is similar to the test accuracy of the model under test (see Table 1). We do not observe an abnormality from the table.

Threats to Construct Validity: Following the literature on fuzzing DL models [15, 23, 50, 70, 97], we focus on evaluating the robust accuracy improvement on clean models because the literature on techniques to fuzz DL models extensively and primarily use this metric to evaluate the effectiveness of fuzzing techniques [15, 23, 50, 70, 97] and, to our best knowledge, a vast majority of, if not all, existing work in the fuzzing literature exclusively evaluates them on clean models. We have also extended the data analysis to include additional metrics (*#AdoLabel* and *#Category*) to evaluate the test case generation dimension without retraining the models under fuzzing [22, 36, 84, 86]. As we will discuss below, we also count the number of test cases generated by each fuzzing technique for each model under fuzzing. We have not evaluated fuzzing techniques using coverage criteria (e.g., neuron coverage) because there is still lacking evidence to show that these criteria strongly correlate to the robustness improvement in the literature, and CLOVER is not a coverage-based technique. Having said that, the experiment also measures the effects of different fuzzers on adversarially trained models.

We use a paired test for hypothesis testing whenever applicable, and if not, we use an unpaired test. We use Cohen’s d to measure the effect size. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test, Mann-Whitney U test, Spearman’s correlation coefficient, and Cohen’s d are statistical test methods that are widely used in software engineering experiments. Using other test methods may obtain other test results.

Due to the small number of generated test cases produced by ADAPT and ROBOT, we only analyze the result for Experiment 6a–6c with $n_4 = 18000$ because ADAPT and ROBOT cannot produce test pools with sufficient test cases to

select at least n_3 test cases for many combinations of n_3 and n_4 where $n_3 = 1000, 2000, 4000, \text{ and } 6000$ and $n_4 = 1800, 3600, \text{ and } 7200$ to make the comparison with CLOVER fair.

In our experiment, even to select 6000 test cases for the largest pool of test cases generated by CLOVER, which contains 0.47 million test cases for case ② (see Table 9), the time cost is less than 10 seconds, less than 0.056% compared to the fuzzing time of 18000 seconds.

Threats to External Validity: We have extended the evaluation to include adversarially trained models as the models under fuzzing. As discussed in Section 4.2.11, we have attempted to include pretrained models as subjects. Due to the weaknesses of peer techniques in our experiment, which could not generate any test cases from them within the time budget affordable to us, we have excluded them in our data analysis to facilitate comparisons among fuzzing techniques on the same ground. In our pre-experiment, the original SENSEI tool [23] was found to be very computationally expensive and was 20x slower than CLOVER for case ② and cannot converge in our experimental setting for example. We also found that if keeping the resulting clean test accuracy within 1% of the original clean test accuracy, the robust accuracy improvement achieved by SENSEI was similar to RANDOM. So, we do not include SENSEI in our evaluation.

We only apply a typical adversarial retraining procedure in the testing-retraining pipeline and only apply one such pipeline adopted from [70] to conduct our experiments. We have also not evaluated the fuzzing and metric-based techniques in other adversarial training settings, such as GRADALIGN [9], which is a regularization strategy over the backpropagation for seeds rather than test cases to incorporate the concept of adversarial training into standard training. Applying CLOVER requires a further investigation on how to model the selected or generated test cases of higher CC values back to their regularization processes. We leave the generalization of the experiment in this aspect as future works.

The baseline models to apply a testing-retraining pipeline are obtained through standard training by training from scratch. An alternative way to obtain an adversarially trained model is to train such a model with adversarial training directly. Our experiment has not compared the robustness of the models delivered through the standard training followed by the testing-retraining pipeline with such adversarially trained models. To compare them, a way is to integrate CLOVER to generate test cases in each epoch of an adversarial training procedure and compare it with other adversarial training methods. We leave the comparison in a future work.

We have repeated Experiments 3 and 6a–6c with repeated trials. We have found that the result of individual repeated trials is within 1% (in #AdvLabel, #Category, #CC and robust accuracy improvement) of the result reported in Sections 6.1 and 8.1. We have also conducted smaller experiments in answering the other RQs due to our limited efforts and the scale of the experiment by repeating them with different (but not all) combinations of $n_1, n_2, n_3, \text{ and } n_4$ in the respective experiments. Moreover, many existing testing works [19, 25, 32, 36, 40, 43, 70] also run their experiments once. Having said that, conducting more repeated trials for each experiment may obtain different results.

The experimental results may be different and more generalizable if the experiment includes more datasets, more model architectures, more peer techniques, more variety of testing-retraining pipelines, more types of model retraining, wider ranges of machine learning hyperparameters and n_1 to n_4 , and more variety of seed lists, selection universes, and benchmark datasets. Moreover, line 4 of Algorithm 2 and lines 5 and 7 in Algorithm 3 can be easily configured to use another attacker technique to perturb samples. Similar to the extension [15] of ROBOT, extending CLOVER to improve the other quality attributes of DL models via testing in the testing-retraining pipeline could be interesting. We have such an extension to future work.

We have evaluated the fuzzing techniques on DL models under test with the same architecture and trained on the same task with different degrees of test and robust accuracy with limited variety. In the literature on fuzzing techniques,

Table 9. Numbers of Test Cases Generated in 18000 Seconds. CLOVER and its Two Variants Achieve Higher Rates of Successfully Generating Test Cases

Model Type	Technique	Case ①	Case ②	Case ③	Case ④
Clean	ADAPT	21044	205003	61417	24251
	ROBOT	45349	106040	45833	18602
	CLOVER+GINI	189367	531735	214958	95560
	CLOVER+FOL	91187	218330	130081	27741
	CLOVER	111894	471795	144247	54763
Model Type	Technique	Case ⑤	Case ⑥	Case ⑦	Case ⑧
Adversarial	ADAPT	87590	68530	41832	30041
	ROBOT	18834	19214	7694	7075
	CLOVER+GINI	171350	154259	75139	67573
	CLOVER+FOL	161293	145520	71255	68855
	CLOVER	173842	160530	78874	70237

we are not aware of experiments to evaluate a fuzzing technique in this setting. Thus, our evaluation using adversarially trained models as models under fuzzing is more like a kind of exploratory study. It seems to us that to support such an evaluation, a novel methodology to systematically produce and sample such a representative set of models could be of interest. We leave the formulation of the methodology and the corresponding comprehensive evaluation as future work.

The three selection universes may differ in robustness-oriented quality due to different implementations and parameters. The values of $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ for $P_{train}^{FGSM+PGD}$ are 57686, 51679, 0.45 for ①, and 65072, 56463, 0.89, for ②, and 47062, 45294, 0.88, for ③, and 45579, 33944, 0.71, for ④, respectively. The values of $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ for P_{train}^{ADAPT} are 4001, 1435, 0.83 for ①, and 11220, 1607, 0.79, for ②, and 4304, 1538, 0.87, for ③, and 3130, 675, 0.66, for ④, respectively. The values of $\#AdvLabel$, $\#Category$, and $\#CC$ for P_{train}^{ROBOT} are 9808, 6225, 0.69, for ①, and 10358, 8461, 0.84, for ②, and 8313, 5702, 0.92, for ③, and 3993, 2704, 0.85, for ④, respectively. We tend to believe that they present different types of scenarios.

The result of the experiment may be different due to the implementation of different fuzzing and metric techniques. Different fuzzing techniques generate different numbers of test cases within the same time budget. Selecting the same number of test cases (n_3) from different test pools of different sizes may affect the results.

We observe that CLOVER is more efficient than ADPAT and ROBOT as summarized in Table 9, CLOVER achieves higher throughputs than ADPAT and ROBOT in generating test cases. We conjecture that this relatively higher efficiency will be retained when fuzzing on other models. However, more experiments should be conducted to accept or reject the conjecture. We have evaluated the key hyperparameters in answering RQ5 and found that the key hyperparameters m , k , δ , and p -norm in the algorithm do not significantly affect the performance of CLOVER. By factoring out the difference in metric adoption and these key hyperparameters, it appears to us that the main difference between CLOVER+FOL and ROBOT for CLOVER+FOL to generate more test cases is the algorithmic design. In the experiment for answering RQ6, configuring CLOVER with CC has a higher throughput than its two variants, but the differences are not as drastic as their results on clean models. We leave the study on the integration between CLOVER and other test case selection metrics as future work.

In Configuration A, test cases are generated by FGSM/PGD and fuzzing techniques over the whole training dataset. For instance, the selection universe generated by FGSM/PGD contains 100000 test cases. From Table 9, there are only limited entries producing at least 100000 test cases. At the same time, in Configuration B, owing to the scale of the

experiment and the lower throughputs of fuzzing techniques, we cannot scale n_3 , n_4 , and the sizes of the input seed lists to all fuzzing techniques to cover larger ranges due to our hardware platform and human effort constraints. For instance, for case ①, to make ADAPT to produce 100000 test cases for the whole training dataset, we estimate it to take $test\ case\ ratio \times time\ spent \times repeated\ trials = 100000/21044 \times 18000 \times 3 = 0.26$ million seconds. We leave the study using a larger-scale experiment as future work.

Our experiment has not evaluated CLOVER on regression models. We leave the evaluation of regression models as future work after generalizing the current notion of seed equivalence (based on discrete class label pairs) to cover seed equivalences over a real number range.

In the experiment, most of the test suites produced by the DL testing technique are combined with the retraining task without triggering AM to perform test suite reduction. The results may be different if there is a test suite reduction task in between the test suite construction task and the retraining task.

10 RELATED WORK

10.1 Deep Learning Testing Metrics

In the literature, many metrics have been proposed to assess DL models.

Diverse structural coverage criteria for assessing the test adequacy of neural network models have been proposed. For brevity, we classify them into the following categories.

The first category is for coverage criteria covering a broad range of feature-map elements (e.g., Neuron Coverage [50], Neuron Boundary Coverage [40], k -multisection Neuron Coverage [40], Strong Neuron Activation Coverage [40], Modified Condition/Decision Coverage [66], top- k Neuron Coverage [40], top- k Neuron Patterns [40]). These criteria aim to assure the forward passes of DL models under test against the possible use and non-use of neurons, which are white-box.

Our CC does not apply to this assurance scenario and is not a coverage criterion (or test adequacy criterion). Rather than applicable to any forward pass, it targets assessing the output effects of a set of forward passes centric around individual test cases. It is a black-box technique because each perturbation added to the test case is obtained through uniform sampling on each dimension of the input feature vector of the test case and only measures the prediction output induced by the forward pass. On the other hand, CLOVER has a notion of even spreading the test case selection from different seeds in Algorithm 4. However, it does not enforce any notion of test adequacy, such as terminating the test case selection procedure if all seeds have at least one test case in the constructing test suite. It also does not judge whether a constructed test suite covering more seeds is more adequate.

The second category is for coverage criteria covering elements exhibiting values in the outlier activation ranges (e.g., likelihood-based Surprise Coverage [32], and distance-based Surprise Coverage [32]). They compute the statistical distributions of activation values of hidden layers on a large dataset and identify specific neurons that once exhibit activation values as outliers of the computed distributions.

Unlike them, our CC metric (see Eq. (1)) computes the alignment rather than outliers and involves no activation value. It is not used as a covering criterion. Furthermore, CLOVER does not use it to formulate the requirements on the coverage items.

Moreover, recent empirical studies [15, 27, 38, 70, 85] show that test suites fulfilling these structural coverage criteria are not correlated with exposing the failures of DL models or improving the robustness after retraining with test suites

fulfilling a high degree of these adequacy criteria. Moreover, these criteria are either too easy or too hard to satisfy [19, 27].

The third category is for these criteria having the concept of explainable Artificial Intelligence (AI), such as [83]. They can provide a white-box witness, such as a coverage path across the principal sets of neurons in different hidden layers in a forward pass [83], for a sample to facilitate developers to understand the core internal pathway going through in the forward pass for a sample. The work [83] also shows that the average ratios of such principal sets of neurons in hidden layers to the set of all neurons in the respective layers are different to some (small to moderate) extent between benign and test cases.

CC neither generates any witness nor explains the internal malfunctions of DL models. It does not distinguish between benign samples and test cases in assessing test cases.

Another line of research in DL model metrics is assessing samples' relative quality. It has been widely applied to sample prioritization for labeling cost reduction or robustness improvement [19, 30, 41, 72, 74]. DeepGini [19] prioritize a test suite through the Gini index [51] and select the top section of the prioritized list for labeling and robustness improvement. The first-order loss [70] measures the extent of a test case correlates with the robustness of DL models. It deems the current state of a sample with a smaller loss value from the last state higher in quality. They are representative and state-of-the-art (metric-based) black-box and white-box (loss-based) metrics, respectively. Our experiment has extensively compared these two metrics with CC. Mutation-based metrics [72, 74] require a higher computational overhead to compute a mutation score or its variant for each sample. Fuzzing easily generates tens of thousands of test cases. It is interesting to measure the mutation scores of CLOVER's generated test suites and prioritize the test cases therein by mutation-based metrics. We leave the empirical study as future work. The unique adversarial label [22, 36] and unique category [36, 84] are another two metrics measuring the quality of generated test suites, and we used them to evaluate CLOVER and peer techniques in our experiments.

10.2 Fuzzing Deep Learning Models

Many fuzzing techniques to generate test cases for the purpose of robustness improvement of DL models via testing-retraining pipelines have been developed.

A vast majority of them [25, 36, 49, 84] focus on the application of structural coverage criteria, such as neuron coverage in Tensorfuzz [49], DeepXplore [50], DLFuzz [25], k -multisection neuron coverage, neuron boundary coverage, and other multi-granularity coverage criteria in DeepHunter [84]. Their fuzzing processes are similar to one another and largely greedy strategies to maximize coverage while sequentially evolving the current state of a sample iteratively. ADAPT adopts a genetic algorithm strategy to adaptively select a small and focus group of coverage items to guide generating perturbed samples from each seed. It is a representative coverage-based and adaptive fuzzing technique. Another type of technique is mutation-based metrics [74, 91] or mutation-based fuzzing techniques [30, 41, 72]. They generate model mutants and perturbed samples in the fuzzing process to prioritize test cases and thus slow. CLOVER evolves the states of each seed sequentially. Unlike them, CLOVER guides its novel fuzzing process on each seed by the novel notion of seed equivalence and shares the knowledge of the adversarial front among different fuzzing rounds on different seeds.

Since structural coverage criteria may not correlate to robustness improvement, newer fuzzing techniques [15, 23, 70] explore the loss aspect (against a loss function) among the variants of each seed. ROBOT [70] evolves each seed toward the direction of smaller first-order loss values. Our experiment in answering RQ4 shows that ROBOT does not outperform RANDOM. SENSEI [23] generates samples toward a larger entropy loss. In each retraining epoch, the publicly available

SENSEI tool generates hundreds of variants for each seed and selects merely the single variant with the largest loss. Like adversarial training, always finetuning a model state with new samples with the largest losses in each training epoch makes the model difficult to converge. It is interesting to further enhance CLOVER into a loss-based technique by considering whether the CC among the test cases produced in the same round of *ContextTranslate* converges. We leave it as future work.

A related pipeline for the testing-retraining pipeline is the testing-repair pipeline, in which the repair task is conducted by a DL model maintenance/debugging technique. Many maintenance techniques to repair DL models have been proposed, which include retraining-based techniques (e.g., MODE [43], DeepFault [16], and DeepRepair [87]), direct-manipulation techniques (e.g., Apricot [88], Arachne [64], and Provable Polytope Repair [65]), and techniques making structural changes to the models under test (e.g., DeepCorrect [14], DeepPatch [75], and PatchNAS [18]). We leave the study on the testing-repair pipeline via CLOVER as future work.

10.3 Retraining in Testing-Retraining Pipeline

In our experiment, we measure the robust accuracy of a retrained model output by a testing-retraining pipeline, in which a DL testing technique is configured to produce a test suite for the retraining subtask.

In the testing-retraining pipeline, the retraining task with adversarial examples is a kind of adversarial retraining [21, 59], which aims to retrain the given DL model with the given adversarial examples for several epochs. In general, these adversarial examples can be generated by many types of techniques or collected elsewhere rather than generation. Like the general adversarial training, retraining can be configured with automated test case generation of adversarial examples (e.g., applying *PGD*, *FGSM*, or *C&W*), but is slow. For instance, Shafahi et al. [58] argue that many adversarial training techniques are time-consuming and not applicable to large-scale datasets. They propose to reuse the gradients with respect to the model’s parameters computed on the backward propagations in the perturbation of inputs at the same pass to produce test cases, which trade the efficiency between adversarial training (compared to *PGD*-based ones) and standard training. Wong et al. [79] target to speed up adversarial training and propose a faster method for *FGSM*-based adversarial training attacking combined with random initialization, which is as effective as *PGD*-based adversarial training with lower cost. Adversarial training methods mentioned above may result in models with the catastrophic overfitting problem, and Andriushchenko and Flammarion [9] propose GradAlign to address it through regularization, which explicitly maximizes the alignment between the gradient of the original inputs and its perturbation set.

Since CLOVER is not an adversarial retraining method, it has not yet considered the efficiency problem when embedding it into the general adversarial (re)training and the minimization problem to reduce the overall model loss with respect to test case generation. Wang et al. [70] further express that DL testing is a strategy to complement adversarial training techniques by generating a more diverse set of adversarial examples. A tight integration of a fuzzing technique, such as CLOVER, with such an adversarial retraining technique in a testing-retraining pipeline could be interesting.

11 CONCLUSION

To enhance the robustness property of DL models, a testing-retraining pipeline can be employed. In such a pipeline, a DL testing technique generates a test suite for the retraining task to retrain the given model under test. The validation of a DL model produced by the pipeline is left to a robust validation dataset independent of the test suites used for retraining. This paper has proposed a novel context-aware fuzzing technique for such a pipeline. CLOVER generates test

cases by a novel seed-equivalent sequence-to-sequence fuzzing algorithm guided by a set of adversarial front objects corresponding to those representative historic test cases measured through our novel metric *Contextual Confidence*. It layers and prioritizes the pool of the generated test cases using the abovementioned metric to construct a test suite. The evaluation results have shown that CLOVER outperforms the state-of-the-art coverage-based fuzzing technique ADAPT and the state-of-the-art loss-based technique ROBOT in the same testing-retraining pipeline, in terms of the numbers of generated test cases, unique adversarial labels, and unique categories in the generated test suites with 2.5×, 2.0×, and 3.5× and 3.6×, 1.6×, and 1.7× of these of ADAPT and ROBOT on fuzzing clean models, respectively. CLOVER also outperforms ADAPT by 2.1×, 3.4×, and 4.5× and outperforms ROBOT by 9.2×, 9.8×, and 11.0× on fuzzing adversarially trained models in these three measurement metrics, respectively. CLOVER is also more effective than ADAPT and ROBOT in robustness improvements on clean models by 72%–154% and 58%–127%, respectively, in ratio. It has achieved a significantly higher robust accuracy improvement by selecting test cases with higher values scored by its metric Contextual Confidence through the pipeline. Moreover, configuring CLOVER with the current metric is more effective than configuring it with the metrics in each of DEEPGINI and ROBOT. Configuring CLOVER with the metrics adopted by ROBOT is also more effective than ROBOT. The major future work includes designing an improved notion of seed equivalence with both successful and unsuccessful test case generation attempts and designing Contextual Confidence to be aware of the seed labels of test cases.

12 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is partly supported by the CityU Grant with project number 9678180.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2017. Fashion-mnist. <https://github.com/zalandoresearch/fashion-mnist>
- [2] 2018. Shiftresnet-cifar. <https://github.com/alvinwan/shiftresnet-cifar>
- [3] 2019. Nninvariant. <https://github.com/DNNInvariant/nninvariant>
- [4] 2021. Adapt. <https://github.com/kupl/ADAPT>
- [5] 2021. RobOT. <https://github.com/SmallkeyChen/RobOT>
- [6] 2022. Clover. <https://github.com/PapRep/Clover>
- [7] 2023. Image Classification on CIFAR-10. <https://paperswithcode.com/sota/image-classification-on-cifar-10>
- [8] IBM Trusted AI. 2017. Adversarial Robustness Toolbox. <https://github.com/Trusted-AI/adversarial-robustness-toolbox>
- [9] Maksym Andriushchenko and Nicolas Flammarion. 2020. Understanding and Improving Fast Adversarial Training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin (Eds.), Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 16048–16059. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/b8ce47761ed7b3b6f48b583350b7f9e4-Paper.pdf
- [10] Devansh Arpit, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Nicolas Ballas, David Krueger, Emmanuel Bengio, Maxinder S. Kanwal, Tegan Maharaj, Asja Fischer, Aaron Courville, Yoshua Bengio, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. 2017. A Closer Look at Memorization in Deep Networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 70)*, Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh (Eds.). PMLR, 233–242. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/arpit17a.html>
- [11] Junjie Bai, Fang Lu, Ke Zhang, et al. 2019. ONNX: Open Neural Network Exchange. <https://github.com/onnx/onnx>.
- [12] Teodora Baluta, Zheng Leong Chua, Kuldeep S Meel, and Prateek Saxena. 2021. Scalable quantitative verification for deep neural networks. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 312–323.
- [13] David Berend, Xiaofei Xie, Lei Ma, Lingjun Zhou, Yang Liu, Chi Xu, and Jianjun Zhao. 2021. Cats Are Not Fish: Deep Learning Testing Calls for out-of-Distribution Awareness. In *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Virtual Event, Australia) (ASE '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1041–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3324884.3416609>
- [14] Tejas S. Borkar and Lina J. Karam. 2019. DeepCorrect: Correcting DNN Models Against Image Distortions. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 28, 12 (2019), 6022–6034. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2019.2924172>
- [15] Jialuo Chen, Jingyi Wang, Xingjun Ma, Youcheng Sun, Jun Sun, Peixin Zhang, and Peng Cheng. 2023. QuoTe: Quality-oriented Testing for Deep Learning Systems. 32, 5, Article 125 (jul 2023), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582573>
- [16] Hasan Ferit Eniser, Simos Gerasimou, and Alper Sen. 2019. DeepFault: Fault Localization for Deep Neural Networks. In *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering*. Reiner Hähnle and Wil van der Aalst (Eds.). Cham, 171–191.

- [17] Andre Esteva, Alexandre Robicquet, Bharath Ramsundar, Volodymyr Kuleshov, Mark DePristo, Katherine Chou, Claire Cui, Greg Corrado, Sebastian Thrun, and Jeff Dean. 2019. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nature medicine* 25, 1 (2019), 24–29.
- [18] Yuchu Fang, Wenzhong Li, Yao Zeng, Yang Zheng, Zheng Hu, and Sanglu Lu. 2023. PatchNAS: Repairing DNNs in Deployment with Patched Network Architecture Search. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'23/IAAI'23/EAAI'23)*. AAAI Press, Article 1661, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i12.26730>
- [19] Yang Feng, Qingkai Shi, Xinyu Gao, Jun Wan, Chunrong Fang, and Zhenyu Chen. 2020. Deepgini: Prioritizing Massive Tests to Enhance the Robustness of Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 177–188.
- [20] Catherine O Fritz, Peter E Morris, and Jennifer J Richler. 2012. Effect Size Estimates: Current Use, Calculations, and Interpretation. *Journal of experimental psychology: General* 141, 1 (2012), 2.
- [21] Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario Marchand, and Victor Lempitsky. 2016. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *The journal of machine learning research* 17, 1 (2016), 2096–2030.
- [22] Xinyu Gao, Yang Feng, Yining Yin, Zixi Liu, Zhenyu Chen, and Baowen Xu. 2022. Adaptive test selection for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (ICSE '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510232>
- [23] Xiang Gao, Ripon K. Saha, Mukul R. Prasad, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2020. Fuzz Testing based Data Augmentation to Improve Robustness of Deep Neural Networks. In *2020 IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 1147–1158.
- [24] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. 2014. Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1412.6572>
- [25] Jianmin Guo, Yu Jiang, Yue Zhao, Quan Chen, and Jianguang Sun. 2018. DLFuzz: Differential Fuzzing Testing of Deep Learning Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Lake Buena Vista, FL, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2018)*. New York, NY, USA, 739–743. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236024.3264835>
- [26] Bo Han, Quanming Yao, Xingrui Yu, Gang Niu, Miao Xu, Weihua Hu, Ivor Tsang, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2018. Co-teaching: Robust training of deep neural networks with extremely noisy labels. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/a19744e268754fb0148b017647355b7b-Paper.pdf
- [27] Fabrice Harel-Canada, Lingxiao Wang, Muhammad Ali Gulzar, Quanquan Gu, and Miryung Kim. 2020. Is Neuron Coverage a Meaningful Measure for Testing Deep Neural Networks?. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Virtual Event, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2020)*. New York, NY, USA, 851–862. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3409754>
- [28] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [29] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. 1990. *Norms for vectors and matrices*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge. 313–386 pages.
- [30] Qiang Hu, Lei Ma, Xiaofei Xie, Bing Yu, Yang Liu, and Jianjun Zhao. 2019. DeepMutation++: A Mutation Testing Framework for Deep Learning Systems. In *2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 1158–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00126>
- [31] Yuheng Huang, Lei Ma, and Yuanchun Li. 2023. PatchCensor: Patch Robustness Certification for Transformers via Exhaustive Testing. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 32, 6, Article 154 (sep 2023), 34 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591870>
- [32] Jinhan Kim, Robert Feldt, and Shin Yoo. 2019. Guiding Deep Learning System Testing Using Surprise Adequacy. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 1039–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00108>
- [33] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. (2009).
- [34] Fred Lambert. 2016. Understanding the fatal Tesla accident on Autopilot and the NHTSA probe. <https://electrek.co/2016/07/01/understanding-fatal-tesla-accident-autopilot-nhtsa-probe/>
- [35] Y. LeCun, B. Boser, J. S. Denker, D. Henderson, R. E. Howard, W. Hubbard, and L. D. Jackel. 1989. Backpropagation Applied to Handwritten Zip Code Recognition. *Neural Computation* 1, 4 (1989), 541–551. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1989.1.4.541>
- [36] Seokhyun Lee, Sooyoung Cha, Dain Lee, and Hakjoo Oh. 2020. Effective White-Box Testing of Deep Neural Networks with Adaptive Neuron Selection Strategy. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (Virtual Event, USA) (ISSTA 2020)*. New York, NY, USA, 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3395363.3397346>
- [37] Renjue Li, Pengfei Yang, Cheng-Chao Huang, Youcheng Sun, Bai Xue, and Lijun Zhang. 2022. Towards Practical Robustness Analysis for DNNs based on PAC-model Learning. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 2189–2201.
- [38] Zenan Li, Xiaoxing Ma, Chang Xu, and Chun Cao. 2019. Structural Coverage Criteria for Neural Networks Could Be Misleading. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (ICSE-NIER)*. 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-NIER.2019.00031>
- [39] Tianming Liu, Eliot Siegel, and Dinggang Shen. 2022. Deep Learning and Medical Image Analysis for COVID-19 Diagnosis and Prediction. *Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering* 24 (2022).
- [40] Lei Ma, Felix Juefei-Xu, Fuyuan Zhang, Jiyuan Sun, Minhui Xue, Bo Li, Chunyang Chen, Ting Su, Li Li, Yang Liu, Jianjun Zhao, and Yadong Wang. 2018. DeepGauge: Multi-Granularity Testing Criteria for Deep Learning Systems. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Montpellier, France) (ASE 2018)*. New York, NY, USA, 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3238147.3238202>

- [41] Lei Ma, Fuyuan Zhang, Jiyuan Sun, Minhui Xue, Bo Li, Felix Juefei-Xu, Chao Xie, Li Li, Yang Liu, Jianjun Zhao, and Yadong Wang. 2018. DeepMutation: Mutation Testing of Deep Learning Systems. In *2018 IEEE 29th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*. 100–111. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSRE.2018.00021>
- [42] Shiqing Ma and Yingqi Liu. 2019. Nic: Detecting Adversarial Samples with Neural Network Invariant Checking. In *Proceedings of the 26th network and distributed system security symposium (NDSS 2019)*.
- [43] Shiqing Ma, Yingqi Liu, Wen-Chuan Lee, Xiangyu Zhang, and Ananth Grama. 2018. MODE: Automated Neural Network Model Debugging via State Differential Analysis and Input Selection. In *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Lake Buena Vista, FL, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2018)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236024.3236082>
- [44] Wei Ma, Mike Papadakis, Anestis Tsakmalis, Maxime Cordy, and Yves Le Traon. 2021. Test Selection for Deep Learning Systems. 30, 2, Article 13 (jan 2021), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3417330>
- [45] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. 2017. Towards Deep Learning Models Resistant to Adversarial Attacks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1706.06083>
- [46] Mark Huasong Meng, Guangdong Bai, Sin Gee Teo, Zhe Hou, Yan Xiao, Yun Lin, and Jin Song Dong. 2022. Adversarial Robustness of Deep Neural Networks: A Survey from a Formal Verification Perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* (2022), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TDSC.2022.3179131>
- [47] Glenford J Myers, Corey Sandler, and Tom Badgett. 2011. *The art of software testing*.
- [48] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bissacco, Bo Wu, and Andrew Y Ng. 2011. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. (2011).
- [49] Augustus Odena, Catherine Olsson, David Andersen, and Ian Goodfellow. 2019. TensorFuzz: Debugging Neural Networks with Coverage-Guided Fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 97)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov (Eds.). 4901–4911. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/odena19a.html>
- [50] Kexin Pei, Yinzhi Cao, Junfeng Yang, and Suman Jana. 2017. DeepXplore: Automated Whitebox Testing of Deep Learning Systems. In *proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 1–18.
- [51] Laura Elena Raileanu and Kilian Stofel. 2004. Theoretical Comparison between the Gini Index and Information Gain Criteria. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 41, 1 (2004), 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:AMAI.0000018580.96245.c6>
- [52] Bruce Ratner. 2009. The correlation coefficient: Its values range between+ 1/- 1, or do they? *Journal of targeting, measurement and analysis for marketing* 17, 2 (2009), 139–142.
- [53] Gregg Rothermel and Mary Jean Harrold. 1997. A safe, efficient regression test selection technique. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 6, 2 (apr 1997), 173–210. <https://doi.org/10.1145/248233.248262>
- [54] Evgenia Rusak, Lukas Schott, Roland S. Zimmermann, Julian Bitterwolf, Oliver Bringmann, Matthias Bethge, and Wieland Brendel. 2020. A Simple Way to Make Neural Networks Robust Against Diverse Image Corruptions. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*. Cham, 53–69.
- [55] Michael Schaeperl and Rajiah Aldrin Denny. 2022. AI-Based protein structure prediction in drug discovery: Impacts and challenges. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 62, 13 (2022), 3142–3156.
- [56] Patrick Schober, Christa Boer, and Lothar A Schwarte. 2018. Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & analgesia* 126, 5 (2018), 1763–1768.
- [57] Andrew W Senior, Richard Evans, John Jumper, James Kirkpatrick, Laurent Sifre, Tim Green, Chongli Qin, Augustin Židek, Alexander WR Nelson, Alex Bridgland, et al. 2020. Improved protein structure prediction using potentials from deep learning. *Nature* 577, 7792 (2020), 706–710.
- [58] Ali Shafahi, Mahyar Najibi, Mohammad Amin Ghiasi, Zheng Xu, John Dickerson, Christoph Studer, Larry S Davis, Gavin Taylor, and Tom Goldstein. 2019. Adversarial training for free!. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/7503cfacd12053d309b6bed5c89de212-Paper.pdf
- [59] Ali Shafahi, Mahyar Najibi, Zheng Xu, John Dickerson, Larry S Davis, and Tom Goldstein. 2020. Universal adversarial training. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 5636–5643.
- [60] Dinggang Shen, Guorong Wu, and Heung-Il Suk. 2017. Deep learning in medical image analysis. *Annual review of biomedical engineering* 19 (2017), 221.
- [61] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556* (2014).
- [62] Mathieu Sinn, Martin Wistuba, Beat Buesser, Maria-Irina Nicolae, and Minh Tran. 2019. Evolutionary Search for Adversarially Robust Neural Networks. *Safe Machine Learning workshop at ICLR* (2019). <https://sites.google.com/view/safeml-iclr2019/accepted-papers>
- [63] Leslie N. Smith. 2017. Cyclical Learning Rates for Training Neural Networks. In *2017 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. 464–472. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WACV.2017.58>
- [64] Jeongju Sohn, Sungmin Kang, and Shin Yoo. 2023. Arachne: Search-Based Repair of Deep Neural Networks. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 32, 4, Article 85 (may 2023), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3563210>
- [65] Matthew Sotoudeh and Aditya V. Thakur. 2021. Provable Repair of Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Virtual, Canada) (PLDI 2021)*. New York, NY, USA, 588–603. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3452111>

- 1145/3453483.3454064
- [66] Youcheng Sun, Min Wu, Wenjie Ruan, Xiaowei Huang, Marta Kwiatkowska, and Daniel Kroening. 2018. Concolic Testing for Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (Montpellier, France) (ASE 2018)*. New York, NY, USA, 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3238147.3238172>
- [67] David M.J Tax and Robert P.W Duin. 1999. Support Vector Domain Description. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 20, 11 (1999), 1191–1199. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8655\(99\)00087-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8655(99)00087-2)
- [68] Yuchi Tian, Kexin Pei, Suman Jana, and Baishakhi Ray. 2018. DeepTest: automated testing of deep-neural-network-driven autonomous cars. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Software Engineering (Gothenburg, Sweden) (ICSE '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 303–314. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3180155.3180220>
- [69] Huiyan Wang, Jingwei Xu, Chang Xu, Xiaoxing Ma, and Jian Lu. 2020. Dissector: Input Validation for Deep Learning Applications by Crossing-Layer Dissection. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (Seoul, South Korea) (ICSE '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 727–738. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377811.3380379>
- [70] Jingyi Wang, Jialuo Chen, Youcheng Sun, Xingjun Ma, Dongxia Wang, Jun Sun, and Peng Cheng. 2021. RobOT: Robustness-Oriented Testing for Deep Learning Systems. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00038>
- [71] Jingyi Wang, Guoliang Dong, Jun Sun, Xinyu Wang, and Peixin Zhang. 2019. Adversarial Sample Detection for Deep Neural Network through Model Mutation Testing. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 1245–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00126>
- [72] Zan Wang, Hanmo You, Junjie Chen, Yingyi Zhang, Xuyuan Dong, and Wenbin Zhang. 2021. Prioritizing Test Inputs for Deep Neural Networks via Mutation Analysis. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 397–409. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00046>
- [73] Mohammad Wardat, Breno Dantas Cruz, Wei Le, and Hridayesh Rajan. 2022. DeepDiagnosis: automatically diagnosing faults and recommending actionable fixes in deep learning programs. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (ICSE '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 561–572. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510071>
- [74] Zhengyuan Wei and W.K. Chan. 2022. Predictive Mutation Analysis of Test Inputs Prioritization for Deep Neural Networks. In *The 22nd IEEE International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability, and Security (QRS)*.
- [75] Zhengyuan Wei, Haipeng Wang, Imran Ashraf, and Wing-Kwong Chan. 2023. DeepPatch: Maintaining Deep Learning Model Programs to Retain Standard Accuracy with Substantial Robustness Improvement. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* (jun 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3604609> Just Accepted.
- [76] Ming Wen, Junjie Chen, Rongxin Wu, Dan Hao, and Shing-Chi Cheung. 2018. Context-Aware Patch Generation for Better Automated Program Repair. In *2018 IEEE/ACM 40th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3180155.3180233>
- [77] Tsui-Wei Weng, Huan Zhang, Pin-Yu Chen, Jinfeng Yi, Dong Su, Yupeng Gao, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Luca Daniel. 2018. Evaluating the Robustness of Neural Networks: An Extreme Value Theory Approach. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1801.10578>
- [78] Martin Wistuba. 2019. Deep Learning Architecture Search by Neuro-Cell-Based Evolution with Function-Preserving Mutations. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2018, Dublin, Ireland, September 10–14, 2018, Proceedings, Part II*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 243–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10928-8_15
- [79] Eric Wong, Leslie Rice, and J Zico Kolter. 2020. Fast is better than free: Revisiting adversarial training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.03994* (2020).
- [80] Robert F Woolson. 2007. Wilcoxon signed-rank test. *Wiley encyclopedia of clinical trials* (2007), 1–3.
- [81] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. 2017. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747* (2017).
- [82] Jiancong Xiao, Yanbo Fan, Ruoyu Sun, Jue Wang, and Zhi-Quan Luo. 2022. Stability Analysis and Generalization Bounds of Adversarial Training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.), Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 15446–15459. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/637de5e2a7a77f741b0b84bd61c83125-Paper-Conference.pdf
- [83] Xiaofei Xie, Tianlin Li, Jian Wang, Lei Ma, Qing Guo, Felix Juefei-Xu, and Yang Liu. 2022. NPC: Neuron Path Coverage via Characterizing Decision Logic of Deep Neural Networks. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 31, 3, Article 47 (Apr 2022), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490489>
- [84] Xiaofei Xie, Lei Ma, Felix Juefei-Xu, Minhui Xue, Hongxu Chen, Yang Liu, Jianjun Zhao, Bo Li, Jianxiong Yin, and Simon See. 2019. DeepHunter: A Coverage-Guided Fuzz Testing Framework for Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (Beijing, China) (ISSTA 2019)*. New York, NY, USA, 146–157. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293882.3330579>
- [85] Shenao Yan, Guanhong Tao, Xuwei Liu, Juan Zhai, Shiqing Ma, Lei Xu, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2020. Correlations Between Deep Neural Network Model Coverage Criteria and Model Quality. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Virtual Event, USA) (ESEC/FSE 2020)*. New York, NY, USA, 775–787. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3409671>
- [86] Hanmo You, Zan Wang, Junjie Chen, Shuang Liu, and Shuochuan Li. 2023. Regression Fuzzing for Deep Learning Systems. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 82–94. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00019>
- [87] Bing Yu, Hua Qi, Qing Guo, Felix Juefei-Xu, Xiaofei Xie, Lei Ma, and Jianjun Zhao. 2022. DeepRepair: Style-Guided Repairing for Deep Neural Networks in the Real-World Operational Environment. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 71, 4 (2022), 1401–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TR.2021.3096332>

- [88] Hao Zhang and W.K. Chan. 2019. Apricot: A Weight-Adaptation Approach to Fixing Deep Learning Models. In *Proceeding of 2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 376–387. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00043>
- [89] Jiliang Zhang and Chen Li. 2020. Adversarial Examples: Opportunities and Challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 31, 7 (2020), 2578–2593. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2019.2933524>
- [90] Mengshi Zhang, Yuqun Zhang, Lingming Zhang, Cong Liu, and Sarfraz Khurshid. 2018. DeepRoad: GAN-Based Metamorphic Testing and Input Validation Framework for Autonomous Driving Systems. In *2018 33rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3238147.3238187>
- [91] Xufan Zhang, Jiawei Liu, Ning Sun, Chunrong Fang, Jia Liu, Jiang Wang, Dong Chai, and Zhenyu Chen. 2021. Duo: Differential Fuzzing for Deep Learning Operators. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 70, 4 (2021), 1671–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TR.2021.3107165>
- [92] Xiaoyu Zhang, Juan Zhai, Shiqing Ma, and Chao Shen. 2021. AUTOTRAINER: An Automatic DNN Training Problem Detection and Repair System. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00043>
- [93] Yuhan Zhi, Xiaofei Xie, Chao Shen, Jun Sun, Xiaoyu Zhang, and Xiaohong Guan. 2023. Seed Selection for Testing Deep Neural Networks. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 33, 1, Article 23 (nov 2023), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3607190>
- [94] Husheng Zhou, Wei Li, Zelun Kong, Junfeng Guo, Yuqun Zhang, Bei Yu, Lingming Zhang, and Cong Liu. 2020. DeepBillboard: Systematic Physical-World Testing of Autonomous Driving Systems. In *2020 IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. 347–358.
- [95] Qilin Zhou, Zhengyuan Wei, Haipeng Wang, and WK Chan. 2023. A Majority Invariant Approach to Patch Robustness Certification for Deep Learning Models. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 1790–1794. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE56229.2023.00137>
- [96] Qilin Zhou, Zhengyuan Wei, Haipeng Wang, Bo Jiang, and Wing-Kwong Chan. 2024. CrossCert: A Cross-Checking Detection Approach to Patch Robustness Certification for Deep Learning Models. 1, FSE, Article 120 (jul 2024), 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3660827>
- [97] Xiaogang Zhu, Sheng Wen, Seyit Camtepe, and Yang Xiang. 2022. Fuzzing: A Survey for Roadmap. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54, 11s, Article 230 (sep 2022), 36 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3512345>
- [98] Chris Ziegler. 2016. A Google self-driving car caused a crash for the first time. <https://www.theverge.com/2016/2/29/11134344/google-self-driving-car-crash-report>

A REVIEWS ON PEER TECHNIQUES USED IN OUR EXPERIMENT

In this section, we revisit the peer techniques we have used in the experiment presented in the paper.

A.1 Attack techniques

FGSM [24] and PGD [45] are well-known adversarial example generation techniques. FGSM finds an adversarial example x' from a seed sample x_0 by increasing the value of the loss function through a single-step scheme: $a = x_0 + \epsilon \cdot \text{sgn}(\nabla_{x_0} L(f, x_0, c_g))$ where ϵ is the parameter to fit a within the perturbation bound, ∇_{x_0} is the gradient of x_0 , sgn is the sign function ($\text{sgn}(d) = 1, 0$, and -1 if $d > 0, d = 0$, and $d < 0$, respectively), and L is the loss function of f to compute the loss of x_0 against the label c_g . **PGD** is an iterative version of FGSM. It has more and finer attacking steps than FGSM starting from $x' \in x_0 + \epsilon$ where $x_0 + \epsilon$ is the L_∞ -ball around x_0 . Then, it iteratively adds a small step size α of the change direction of a sample to that sample. Specifically, if $x_0 + \epsilon$ is a closed convex set, the projection on $x_0 + \epsilon$ (in the sense of projection operator $\prod_{x_0 + \epsilon}(\cdot)$ in convex optimization) is defined as $x^{t+1} = \prod_{x_0 + \epsilon}(x^t + \alpha \cdot \text{sgn}(\nabla_{x^t} L(f, x^t, c_g)))$ and $\prod_{x_0 + \epsilon}(x^{t+1}) = \arg \min_{x^{t+1} \in x_0 + \epsilon} \frac{1}{2} \|x^{t+1} - x^t\|_2^2$, where x^t is initialized as x' at the starting point.

A.2 Fuzzing techniques

ROBOT [70] is the state-of-the-art robustness-oriented testing framework. It generates test cases from the same seed until their first-order losses (FOLs) converge. It then retrains the model under test with a subset A of the generated test cases.

ROBOT includes two test case selection techniques (BE-ST and KM-ST), a metric called first-order loss (FOL), a fuzzing algorithm (FOL-Fuzz), and a model retraining step. Suppose x_0 is a seed. The FOL value for a test case $x' \in x_0 + \epsilon$ (which is the ϵ -ball of x_0) is defined as $\text{FOL}(x') = \epsilon \cdot \|\nabla_{x_0} L(f, x', c_g)\|_2$, which is generated by FOL-Fuzz.

FOL-Fuzz generates test cases iteratively, which can be expressed recursively as follows. Let S^t and x^t be the working list and working sample in the t^{th} iteration, and $S^0 = \langle x_0 \rangle$. Let $C1(x^t)$ denote the condition FOL(x^t) larger than the maximal FOL value of the samples in S^{t-1} and $C2(x^t)$ denote the condition FOL(x^t) $< \xi$ (where $\xi = 10^{-18}$ in [70]). S^t is computed as $S^{t-1} + \langle x^t \rangle$ if either $C1(x^t)$ or $C2(x^t)$ is satisfied, otherwise S^{t-1} . x^t is perturbed from the sample $S^{t-1}[0]$ along the gradient with respect to its proposed loss function [70], which includes the FOL value FOL($S^{t-1}[0]$) as a term. If either $C1(x^t)$ or $C2(x^t)$ is satisfied and the prediction label of $x^t \neq$ the prediction label of x_0 , then x^t is marked as a test case. FOL-Fuzz repeats the above process several times for each seed. ROBOT then puts all the marked test cases of all seeds into a list P followed by selecting a subset A from P .

ADAPT [36] is the state-of-the-art coverage-based technique that uses a genetic algorithm to explore the coverage space. It designs a set of neuron-level and activation-level features to measure the coverage of each test case. It proposes a genetic-algorithm-based fuzzing technique to adaptively select neurons for those designed features to evolve test cases towards higher coverage.

The details of ADAPT are as follows. A chromosome in ADAPT is a vector of 29 real numbers within $[-1, 1]$. ADAPT first generates a set P of random chromosomes. Let x^t be a working sample in the t^{th} iteration to generate a test case for a given seed x_0 where $x^0 = x_0$. For each chromosome $p \in P$, ADAPT computes a score as the dot product of p and a feature vector of each neuron when the model f predicts an output for x^t . (For this purpose, ADAPT designs 29 neuron-level Boolean features, such as whether the neuron is located in the first 25% layers under the measure, to produce the feature vector for the neuron.) It then selects the top- m (where $m = 10$ in [36]) neurons with the highest score and perturbs x^t into x^{t+1} against the loss of these m neurons. ADAPT measures the neuron coverage achieved by x^{t+1} . It next reduces P

to a minimal subset S that retains the same coverage as P . If $|S|$ is smaller than a required threshold, chromosomes in P covering most coverage items are added to S until the threshold is met. ADAPT then iteratively (1) crossovers two randomly-picked chromosomes in S followed by adding Gaussian noise to construct a new chromosome A and (2) places A into S until $|S| = |P|$. The resultant S is assigned to P , and x^{t+1} becomes the working sample. The iteration to process P (the $(t + 1)^{th}$ iteration for x_0) repeats until the fuzzing budget is exhausted. The original experiment [36] shows that ADAPT can achieve higher coverage than fuzzing without using the adaptive strategy.

A.3 Metric-based techniques

DEEPGINI is a metric-based test case prioritization technique. Given a test case x and the probability output predicted by a model $\langle p_{x,1}, p_{x,2}, \dots, p_{x,N} \rangle$, where N is the number of classes and $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$, the Gini metric in DEEPGINI is denoted by $\xi(\cdot)$, where $\xi(x) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^N p_{x,i}^2$. DEEPGINI [19] interprets $\xi(\cdot)$ as follows: (1) Given two test cases x_1 and x_2 , “ $\xi(x_1) > \xi(x_2)$ implies that x_1 is more likely to be misclassified”, and (2) “The tests prioritized by DEEPGINI at the front are more effective to improve DNN quality than the tests prioritized at the back.”

BE-ST [70] generates A with n samples by reordering test cases in P with their FOL values followed by selecting the top- $\frac{n}{2}$ and bottom- $\frac{n}{2}$ test cases from the reordered P . On the other hand, KM-ST [70] generates A by equally dividing the reordered P into k sections and randomly picking $\frac{n}{k}$ samples from each section. Finally, ROBOT retrains the model with the original training dataset of f and A . In the experiment [70], ROBOT sets a short fuzzing time budget and a small iteration bound of 3 for x to limit the number of generated test cases (to alleviate the loss in standard accuracy for less than 1% as it retrains the original model with all generated test cases after selection).

A.4 Defender technique

NIC [42] proposes a technique to detect adversarial examples by formulating statistical invariants among hidden layers over benign samples and monitoring their violations. It extracts an internal state of each hidden layer and each pair of consecutive hidden layers in the forward passes of f for benign samples. It then develops machine-learning models for each such state and sets up an ensemble of these models to maximize the prediction probability of a sample being benign. It effectively detects a wide range of adversarial examples with low false positive rates in its experiment.

NIC extracts the activation values $av_l(x)$ of each hidden layer l in the model f for each sample x in a training dataset D . It then constructs a regression model $VI(l)$ for the layer l by learning the weight w of the $VI(l)$ model through solving $\min_{x \in DL} (av_l(x) \cdot w^T - 1)$. It then constructs a submodel of f for layer l by trimming off all the layers after l and appending the trimmed submodel with a softmax layer. It only trains the softmax layer of this extended submodel on D to produce a trained model P_l for layer l . Similar to the construction of $VI(l)$, for each consecutive pair of hidden layers $\langle l, l + 1 \rangle$ in f , NIC constructs a regression model $PI(l)$ by learning the weight w of the $PI(l)$ model through solving $\min_{x \in DL} ([P_l(x) P_{l+1}(x)] \cdot w^T - 1)$. Finally, NIC trains a one-class support vector machine [67] (OSVM) model with the radial basis function kernel. The OSVM model takes the outputs of $VI(l)$ and $PI(l)$ for all hidden layers $l \in f$ on each sample in D as an input sample. It learns to predict the similarity score of each sample in D to 1 (benign).

In the detection time, if the output $OSVM(x)$ for a test case x is smaller than a threshold, x is deemed as an adversarial example.

A.5 Neural Network Invariant for Abnormal State Detection

NIC [42] is an approach to producing a defender to detect adversarial examples by formulating a set of statistical invariants among the hidden layers over a set of samples and monitoring their violations through a one-class classifier.

For each hidden layer l in a given model f , NIC extracts the activation values $av_l(x)$ for each sample x in the training dataset D of f . It trains a regression model Inv_l for every hidden layer l of f with $\cup_{x \in D} av_l(x)$ as the training dataset and a regression model $Pro_{l,l+1}$ for every consecutive pair of hidden layers $\langle l, l+1 \rangle$ of f with $\cup_{x \in D} \langle Inv_l(x), Inv_{l+1}(x) \rangle$ as training dataset. The outputs of all these regression models are used to train a one-class support vector machine (OSVM) [67] with the radial basis function kernel to learn to predict the similarity score of each sample in D to 1. In the detection time, if the output of the OSVM with a test case t as input is smaller than a threshold, t is reported as an adversarial example. We refer to each regression model (Inv_l or $Pro_{l,l+1}$) as a **neural network invariant**. A sample violating more neural network invariants tends to deviate more from being benign. We refer to a violation of a neural network invariant as an exposure of an **abnormal neural network state**.

If a model f contains R hidden layers, then NIC must train and generate $2R - 1$ regression models (invariants for short) and one OSVM model. Thus, the training process and detecting whether a test case is an adversarial example are both slow. Their experiment [42] shows that NIC can correctly detect 92% to 100% adversarial examples on many models.

Intuitively, a stronger defender may be obtained by designing more precise kernel functions to cover desirable inputs with low regression values output by the invariants or strengthening the invariants. As such, test suites that expose more abnormal neural network states provide more data points for more accurate estimations on the low regression value patterns for developers to design more expressive kernel functions or source desirable benign samples to improve the invariants.

Let X be a set of seeds and P be a test suite generated from X to test a model f . Each such test case in P is within the ϵ -ball of its corresponding seed measured in a p -norm distance. Let t and t' in P be two test cases perturbed from the same seed x (denoted by $t \approx t'$). Suppose further t' is in δ -ball of t (i.e., $\|t - t'\|_p < \delta$) where $\delta \ll \epsilon$. Suppose we find a subset $A \subseteq P$ such that A simulates P in the sense that each sample t' in the set $P - A$ is in the δ -ball of the same sample t in A , and the prediction vectors $\vec{f}(t)$ and $\vec{f}(t')$ are similar. If a defender (e.g., [42]) of f can reject t , it has a good chance to reject t' ; and a patched architecture of f produced by a model maintainer (e.g., [18, 75]) that can infer t correctly may infer t' correctly as well.

B DETAILED RESULTS ON TEST CASE GENERATION

The values depicted in Figures 11 and 12 for answering RQ3 can be found in Tables 10 and 11. The values depicted in Figures 14 and 15 for answering RQ4 are shown in Table 12 and 13. The values depicted in Figures 23 and 24 for answering RQ6 are shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 10. Mean Results of Test Suites Generated by 3 Techniques on Fuzzing Clean Models in Configuration B for 3 Runs with N_3 and $n_4 = 18000$

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 1000$			$n_3 = 2000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	ADAPT	780	669	0.81	1297	959	0.83
	ROBOT	917	896	0.68	1713	1633	0.68
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
②: SVHN+LeNet5	ADAPT	770	604	0.79	1384	930	0.78
	ROBOT	797	789	0.84	1561	1542	0.84
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	678	615	0.87	1207	999	0.87
	ROBOT	916	800	0.92	1474	1419	0.92
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	658	467	0.65	1078	632	0.67
	ROBOT	772	729	0.85	1316	1182	0.86
	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
Mean Results	ADAPT	721.50	588.75	0.78	1241.50	880.00	0.79
	ROBOT	850.50	803.5	0.82	1516.00	1444.00	0.82
	CLOVER	1000.00	1000.00	0.99	2000.00	2000.00	0.99
	CLOVER÷ADAPT	1.39	1.70	1.27	1.61	2.27	1.26
	CLOVER÷ROBOT	1.18	1.24	1.20	1.32	1.39	1.20
Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 4000$			$n_3 = 6000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	ADAPT	1890	1172	0.83	2359	1281	0.83
	ROBOT	2995	2740	0.69	4003	3517	0.69
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
②: SVHN+LeNet5	ADAPT	2526	1261	0.79	3384	1415	0.78
	ROBOT	2810	2750	0.84	3747	3615	0.84
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	1911	1314	0.87	2282	1410	0.87
	ROBOT	2513	2317	0.92	3432	3079	0.91
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	1590	662	0.67	1861	672	0.66
	ROBOT	2093	1787	0.85	2551	2104	0.85
	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
Mean Results	ADAPT	1979.25	1102.25	0.79	2471.50	1194.50	0.79
	ROBOT	2602.75	2398.50	0.82	3433.25	3078.75	0.82
	CLOVER	4000.00	4000.00	0.99	6000.00	6000.00	0.99
	CLOVER÷ADAPT	2.02	3.63	1.25	2.43	5.02	1.26
	CLOVER÷ROBOT	1.54	1.67	1.20	1.75	1.95	1.20

Table 11. Mean Results of *All* Test Cases Generated by Three Techniques on Fuzzing Clean Models in Configuration *B* for 3 Runs with $n_4 = 18000$

Benchmark Case	Technique	<i>All</i>		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	ADAPT	4001	1435	0.83
	ROBOT	9808	6225	0.69
	CLOVER	23638	17457	0.96
②: SVHN+LeNet5	ADAPT	11220	1607	0.79
	ROBOT	10358	8461	0.84
	CLOVER	21777	15975	0.94
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	ADAPT	4304	1538	0.87
	ROBOT	8313	5702	0.92
	CLOVER	27407	17169	0.98
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	ADAPT	3130	675	0.66
	ROBOT	3993	2704	0.85
	CLOVER	20237	13596	0.87
Mean Results	ADAPT	5663.75	1313.75	0.79
	ROBOT	8118.00	5773.00	0.83
	CLOVER	23264.75	16049.25	0.94
	CLOVER÷ADAPT	4.11	12.22	1.19
	CLOVER÷ROBOT	2.87	2.78	1.13

C ADDITIONAL EXPLORATORY STUDY

In this section, we describe an exploratory study to explore the ability of CLOVER to generate test cases that violate the neural network invariants extracted from defenders. We recall that given a coverage criterion (e.g., neuron coverage), covering more coverage items in a DL model by a test suite does not necessarily indicate that the test suite will be more useful in robustness improvement. Moreover, the grounded theory between a coverage criterion and robustness improvement remains to be developed. Thus, through this exploratory study, we do not aim to give a conclusion on the correlation between abnormal neuron network state and how these violations relate to the quality of the test cases generated from the model under test in general. Rather, we would like to lay the groundwork for future research by exploring whether neural network invariant violation may be another evaluation dimension for fuzzing techniques.

Recall that a neural network invariant extracted from a model under fuzzing is constructed from the dataset for training the model under fuzzing. Intuitively, it captures the essence of the model under fuzzing against the training task. We assume that fuzzing techniques are not able to obtain the outputs from the defenders and know their algorithms and defense strategies. Thus, the fuzzing techniques only generate test cases based on the models under fuzzing. Violating an invariant might be seen as an indirect indicator of whether a test case has the potential to be further developed to escape from the monitor of the defender in question.

Readers may want to know the implications of invariant violations. A test suite with more test cases passing through the invariants can seem to be more demanding for the defender to defend with (note that all test cases are already adversarial examples of the model under fuzzing). So, from the defender’s viewpoint, such test suites will be more interesting. Nonetheless, the focus of fuzzing is on the model under fuzzing. If a test case violates fewer invariants, intuitively, its feature vector is closer to a typical value in the latent space of the defender over the training dataset to be within the normal range. A defender has a series of neural network invariants, each invariant having its own perspective to determine whether a feature vector is within a normal range. Thus, a test case violating a higher number of invariants

Table 12. Results of Test Suites Generated by CLOVER and its Variants on Fuzzing Clean Models in Configuration B with $n_3 \in \mathcal{N}_3$ and $n_4 = 18000$

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 1000$			$n_3 = 2000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	928	859	0.30	1778	1621	0.34
	CLOVER+FOL	868	853	0.90	1580	1542	0.89
②: SVHN+LeNet5	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	448	357	0.27	887	692	0.30
	CLOVER+FOL	861	856	0.91	1703	1692	0.89
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	977	975	0.37	1897	1882	0.42
	CLOVER+FOL	812	795	0.95	1472	1426	0.96
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	1000	2000	0.99	2000	2000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	976	997	0.23	1896	1980	0.27
	CLOVER+FOL	694	604	0.78	1231	1065	0.78
Mean Results	CLOVER	1000.00	1000.00	0.99	2000.00	2000.00	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	832.25	797.00	0.29	1614.50	1543.75	0.33
	CLOVER+FOL	808.75	777.00	0.89	1496.50	1431.25	0.88
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER} + \text{GINI})$	1.20	1.25	3.39	1.24	1.30	2.97
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER} + \text{FOL})$	1.24	1.29	1.12	1.34	1.40	1.12
Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 4000$			$n_3 = 6000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
①: FashionMnist+VGG16	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	3411	3073	0.40	4698	4102	0.45
	CLOVER+FOL	2550	2442	0.89	3229	3043	0.89
②: SVHN+LeNet5	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	1710	1301	0.34	2364	1762	0.36
	CLOVER+FOL	3143	3083	0.89	4330	4243	0.89
③: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	3629	3569	0.49	5234	5087	0.55
	CLOVER+FOL	2466	2334	0.96	3054	2849	0.96
④: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.99	6000	6000	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	3573	3889	0.33	5070	5595	0.38
	CLOVER+FOL	2196	1889	0.76	2922	2562	0.76
Mean Results	CLOVER	4000.00	4000.00	0.99	6000.00	6000.00	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	3080.75	2958.00	0.39	4341.50	4136.50	0.44
	CLOVER+FOL	2588.75	2437.00	0.87	3383.75	2174.25	0.88
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER} + \text{GINI})$	1.30	1.35	2.54	1.38	1.45	2.27
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER} + \text{FOL})$	1.55	1.64	1.13	1.77	1.89	1.13

indicates that the test case contains more feature combinations that violate these normal ranges simultaneously. Since all these invariants are constructed on the training dataset of the model under fuzzing and the latent space of the model under fuzzing, intuitively, the test case, as an adversarial example, contains more features that the model under fuzzing should be learned against with so that the improved version of the model (probably after retraining) can avoid classifying the test case wrongly. In this regard, such a test case is a harder adversarial example than the one violating a lower number of invariants. At the same time, to improve a DL model, a test suite rather than a single test case is required. Nonetheless, how the features of a test case in one invariant are connected to the feature space of the model

Table 13. Results of *All* Test Cases Generated by CLOVER Variants on Fuzzing Clean Models in Configuration *B*

Benchmark Case	Technique	<i>All</i>		
		# <i>AdvLabel</i>	# <i>Category</i>	# <i>CC</i>
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	23638	17457	0.96
	CLOVER+GINI	24891	17471	0.96
	CLOVER+FOL	14565	13092	0.89
⑥: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	21777	15975	0.94
	CLOVER+GINI	21902	15988	0.93
	CLOVER+FOL	19597	15704	0.86
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	27407	17169	0.98
	CLOVER+GINI	28117	17169	0.97
	CLOVER+FOL	18966	16517	0.94
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	20237	13596	0.87
	CLOVER+GINI	26211	13707	0.91
	CLOVER+FOL	14202	13438	0.72
Mean Results	CLOVER	23264.75	16049.25	0.99
	CLOVER+GINI	25280.25	16083.75	0.94
	CLOVER+FOL	16832.50	14687.75	0.85
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER+GINI})$	0.92	1.00	0.99
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER+FOL})$	1.38	1.09	1.10

under test and its retrained version is yet to be discovered. Thus, in the exploratory study, we do not claim that a higher number of violations achieved by a test suite indicates that the test suite is better for the model under fuzzing.

We aim to study the following two research questions:

RQ7: To what extent is CLOVER in Configuration *A* effective in exposing abnormal neural network states of defenders [42] for the models under test?

RQ8: To what extent is CLOVER in Configuration *B* effective in exposing abnormal neural network states of defenders [42] for the models under test?

Experiment 7 (for Answering RQ7): For NIC, we follow the description and parameters in [42] and adopt the OSVM [67] model implemented in the *sklearn* library with radial basis function kernel, $nu = 1e^{-5}$, and the default values for all the other parameters.

To measure the effectiveness of test suites either generated by fuzzing techniques or test case selection techniques on the neural network states of a model under test, for each such test case, we count the number of abnormal neural network states (generated by NIC from the model under test) in the forward pass for the test case. We refer to the counted value for each test case as the **number of abnormal neural network states**.

For each model under test, we implement NIC (see Section A.5) and configure the parameters following the description in [42] because their source code is not publicly available in its project repository [3].

We first apply NIC on each model and the training dataset of the model to output the set of neural network invariant models for the model. There are 25, 9, 39, and 111 invariant models for the four cases (① to ④), respectively. We then apply each test case selection technique (RANDOM, DEEPGINI, BE-ST, KM-ST and CLOVER) to select 2000 test cases from the selection universe $P_{train}^{\text{FGSM+PGD}}$ for the model under test. We finally run the model under test to infer each selected test case and measure the number of abnormal neural network states incurred by its forward pass. Owing to the large

Table 14. Results of Test Suites Generated by CLOVER and its Variants on Fuzzing Adversarially Trained Models in Configuration B with different $n_3 \in N_3$ and $n_4 = 18000$

Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 1000$			$n_3 = 2000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.91	2000	2000	0.85
	CLOVER+GINI	57	46	0.23	96	79	0.24
	CLOVER+FOL	898	898	0.60	1632	1631	0.61
⑥: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.79	2000	2000	0.69
	CLOVER+GINI	49	37	0.20	91	70	0.21
	CLOVER+FOL	874	873	0.50	1523	1519	0.51
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.82	2000	2000	0.71
	CLOVER+GINI	154	127	0.11	295	235	0.12
	CLOVER+FOL	873	873	0.49	1510	1502	0.49
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	1000	1000	0.68	2000	2000	0.56
	CLOVER+GINI	128	101	0.09	253	197	0.10
	CLOVER+FOL	850	844	0.40	1447	1436	0.40
Mean Results	CLOVER	1000.00	1000.00	0.80	2000.00	2000.00	0.70
	CLOVER+GINI	97.00	77.75	0.16	183.75	145.25	0.17
	CLOVER+FOL	873.75	872.00	0.50	1528.00	1522.00	0.50
	CLOVER÷(CLOVER+GINI)	10.31	12.86	5.08	10.88	13.77	4.20
	CLOVER÷(CLOVER+FOL)	1.14	1.15	1.61	1.31	1.31	1.40
Benchmark Case	Technique	$n_3 = 4000$			$n_3 = 6000$		
		#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.72	5595	5550	0.66
	CLOVER+GINI	202	167	0.25	283	240	0.26
	CLOVER+FOL	2630	2614	0.61	3333	3307	0.60
⑥: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.56	4560	4431	0.56
	CLOVER+GINI	170	135	0.22	239	194	0.23
	CLOVER+FOL	2424	2401	0.50	2900	2874	0.50
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.57	5213	4911	0.53
	CLOVER+GINI	545	442	0.14	817	678	0.16
	CLOVER+FOL	2431	1402	0.49	2973	2925	0.49
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	4000	4000	0.44	4525	4245	0.42
	CLOVER+GINI	466	380	0.11	687	571	0.12
	CLOVER+FOL	2202	2174	0.41	2690	2630	0.40
Mean Results	CLOVER	4000.00	4000.00	0.57	4973.42	4784.58	0.54
	CLOVER+GINI	345.75	281.00	0.18	506.50	420.75	0.19
	CLOVER+FOL	2421.75	2147.75	0.50	2974.00	2934.00	0.50
	CLOVER÷(CLOVER+GINI)	11.57	14.23	3.19	9.82	11.37	2.81
	CLOVER÷(CLOVER+FOL)	1.65	1.86	1.14	1.67	1.63	1.09

number of extracted feature maps required to produce each invariant model and the many invariant models needed to be created, the application of `nic` on each model under test is time-consuming in both code development and execution.

Experiment 8 (for Answering RQ8): We repeat Experiment 3 with $n_4=18000$, except that we use the test suites with 6000 test cases generated by each fuzzing technique.

Answering RQ7: Fig. 26 summarizes the result of Experiment 3. There are four plots, one for each case (① to ④). Each boxplot in each plot is the number of abnormal neural network states (indicated by the y -axis) of the technique indicated by the x -value. The y -axis in subplots (a)–(b) and (c)–(d) are the number of abnormal neural network states

Table 15. Results of All Test Cases Generated by CLOVER and its Variants on Fuzzing Adversarially Trained Models in Configuration B

Benchmark Case	Technique	#AdvLabel	#Category	#CC
⑤: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	5627	5550	0.59
	CLOVER+GINI	5293	5068	0.57
	CLOVER+FOL	5288	5073	0.60
⑥: CIFAR10+ResNet20	CLOVER	4624	4431	0.49
	CLOVER+GINI	4305	4105	0.48
	CLOVER+FOL	4289	4108	0.49
⑦: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	5375	4911	0.49
	CLOVER+GINI	4898	4530	0.49
	CLOVER+FOL	4865	4533	0.49
⑧: CIFAR100+ResNet56	CLOVER	4646	4245	0.40
	CLOVER+GINI	4130	3844	0.40
	CLOVER+FOL	4082	3847	0.40
Mean Results	CLOVER	5067.92	4784.58	0.49
	CLOVER+GINI	4656.50	4386.75	0.49
	CLOVER+FOL	4631.00	4390.25	0.50
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER+GINI})$	1.09	1.09	1.01
	$\text{CLOVER} \div (\text{CLOVER+FOL})$	1.09	1.09	0.99

and the logarithmic value (with base 2) of the number of abnormal neural network states, respectively. The numbers of abnormal neural network states exposed by RANDOM, DEEPGINI, BE-ST, KM-ST, and CLOVER are summarized (from left to right for each case) as follows. Across the board, in general, CLOVER is more effective than BE-ST, followed by the group for KM-ST and RANDOM and then DEEPGINI.

case ①: 5754, 2400, 8942, 7645, **9656**.

case ②: 607, 45, 1303, 374, **1160**.

case ③: 3841, 716, 7661, 3009, **15623**.

case ④: 7831, 6415, 9577, 6551, **24695**.

In all four cases, observed from Fig. 26, CLOVER also consistently achieves a higher median in the number of abnormal neural network states than the other techniques.

We also conduct the Mann-Whitney U test with Bonferroni correction at the 5% significance level and calculate the effect sizes by Cohen’s d to check whether the differences in the number of exposed abnormal neural network states between RANDOM and the other four techniques are statistically meaningful.

We summarize the main findings from the statistical comparison below.

In all four cases, CLOVER is significantly different from RANDOM, where the p -values are all smaller than $1e^{-5}$, and its means are larger than the means for RANDOM. BE-ST has the widest range of outlier points above the box. In all other comparisons between CLOVER and each peer technique, the means for CLOVER are always larger. The effect size of comparing CLOVER to RANDOM for cases ① to ④ are 0.51, 0.43, 1.09, and 0.53. The observed differences in effect size between CLOVER and RANDOM is medium or higher in three out of four cases, and the last is close to medium (case ②). Their observed differences are not negligible. We also find that the pair of CLOVER and RANDOM produces a larger effect size than each pair of RANDOM and a peer technique.

DEEPGINI is significantly different from RANDOM (p -values all smaller than $1e^{-5}$) except in case ③. In case ③, the means for DEEPGINI are always smaller than those for RANDOM in all four cases. The effect sizes for the RANDOM and




Fig. 25. Numbers of Abnormal Neural Network States Exposed by Different Techniques in Configuration A

DEEPGINI pair are 0.17, 0.59, 0.19, and 0.08 for cases ① to ④, meaning that the differences are small in all but case ② and could be negligible. In case ②, DEEPGINI is smaller than RANDOM in both mean and median, RANDOM is a better choice.

BE-ST is significantly different from RANDOM with p -values equal to 0.01, $\leq 1e^{-5}$, $2.41e^{-3}$, and $\leq 1e^{-5}$ for the four cases, respectively. However, their effect sizes are only 0.11, 0.35, 0.33, and 0.11, respectively, meaning that the differences are either very small or small, which are negligible.

KM-ST is significantly different from RANDOM in two cases (② and ③) out of the four. The p -values are smaller than $1e^{-5}$ in these two cases. The means for KM-ST are smaller than those for RANDOM in all cases except case ①. In cases ① and ④, we cannot find there are any significant differences between KM-ST and RANDOM with the p -values equal to 0.61 and 0.37, respectively. In the remaining two cases (② and ③), the effect sizes are 0.20 and 0.05 only, respectively, meaning that the differences are small and could be negligible.

CLOVER is significantly different from DEEPGINI, BE-ST, and KM-ST (p -values all smaller than $1e^{-5}$) in all cases. The Cohen's d effect sizes between CLOVER and DEEPGINI, BE-ST, and KM-ST are: 0.58, 0.40, 0.48 for Case ①; 1.17, 0.07, 0.67 for Case ②; 1.46, 0.51, 1.27 for Case ③; and 0.59, 0.50, 0.60 for Case ④, respectively. Based on the effect size, the difference between CLOVER and BE-ST in Case ② could be negligible because the effect size is only 0.07. The effect sizes between CLOVER and BE-ST, KM-ST for Case ① are 0.40 and 0.48, respectively, which are close to medium and could not be ignored. The effect sizes in the remaining cases are all greater than the medium level (and even greater than the very large level in some cases).




Fig. 26. Numbers of Abnormal Neural Network States Exposed by Different Techniques in Configuration *B*

The overall result indicates that CLOVER produces test cases that expose a higher number of abnormal neural network states than the peer techniques. The effect of CLOVER relative to other techniques is not due to randomness in a statistical meaning way (p -value < 0.0001 , and medium or higher effect size in three cases and close to the medium in the remaining case).

Answering RQ8: Fig. 26 summarizes the result of Experiment 6. Its x -axis and y -axis can be interpreted like Fig. 26. The three techniques along the x -axis from left to right are ADAPT, ROBOT, and CLOVER. The numbers of abnormal neural network states exposed by ADAPT, ROBOT, and CLOVER in each of the four cases are summarized below from left to right.

- case ①: 12539, 13896, **15227**.
- case ②: 1043, 1460, **3542**.
- case ③: 22274, 22182, **38122**.
- case ④: 99695, 127521, **247737**.

In all four cases, CLOVER achieves higher medians in the number of abnormal neural network states than the other techniques. On average, CLOVER exposed 125% and 90% more abnormal neural network states compared to ADAPT and ROBOT, respectively.

We conduct the Mann-Whitney U test with Bonferroni correction and calculate the effect size by Cohen's d to check whether the difference in the number of abnormal neural network states between CLOVER and each of the other two techniques (ADAPT and ROBOT) is statistically meaningful.

The p -values for cases ① to ④ are all smaller than $1e^{-5}$, meaning there are significant differences between CLOVER and the other two techniques (ADAPT and ROBOT) at the 5% significance level. The effect sizes for cases ① to ④ are: 0.27, 0.64, 0.54, and 1.70 between CLOVER and ADAPT, and 0.15, 0.52, 0.59, and 1.24 between CLOVER and ROBOT. Only the effect sizes (case ① for CLOVER and ROBOT) are at the small level. All the other effect sizes are at the medium or higher level, which means the observed differences are not negligible.

We also recall that FGSM/PGD and fuzzing techniques are used to generate the selection universes in Experiment 3 of Configuration A. In contrast, the test suites are generated by CLOVER in Experiment 6 of Configuration B. On average, each test case of RANDOM and CLOVER expose 2.25 and 6.39 abnormal neural network states in Experiment 3 for Configuration A, respectively. On the other hand, each test case of CLOVER exposes 12.69 abnormal neural network states in Experiment 6 for Configuration B on average. The difference is large. We also conduct the Mann-Whitney U test with Bonferroni correction and calculate the effect size by Cohen's d among all four cases to further compare the performance between CLOVER in Experiments 3 and 6 and between RANDOM in Experiment 3 and CLOVER in Experiment 6. The p -values are both $1e^{-5}$. The effect sizes are 0.62 (medium) and 0.67 (medium) in the two comparisons, respectively, indicating that the higher effectiveness of CLOVER in Experiment 6 than both CLOVER and RANDOM in Experiment 3 is statistically meaningful.

Answering RQ7

CLOVER in Configuration A is more discriminative than current state-of-the-art test case selection techniques in terms of the number of abnormal neural network states.

Answering RQ8

CLOVER in Configuration B is more discriminating than other robustness-oriented fuzzing techniques in exposing the abnormal neural network states of DL models.