

# Towards Fast Computation of Certified Robustness for ReLU Networks

Tsui-Wei Weng<sup>\*†</sup>   Huan Zhang<sup>\*‡</sup>   Hongge Chen<sup>§</sup>   Zhao Song<sup>¶</sup>   Cho-Jui Hsieh<sup>||</sup>  
 Duane Boning<sup>\*\*</sup>   Inderjit S. Dhillon<sup>††</sup>   Luca Daniel<sup>‡‡</sup>

## Abstract

Verifying the robustness property of a general Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) network is an NP-complete problem [Katz, Barrett, Dill, Julian and Kochenderfer CAV17]. Although finding the *exact* minimum adversarial distortion is hard, giving a *certified lower bound* of the minimum distortion is possible. Current available methods of computing such a bound are either time-consuming or delivering low quality bounds that are too loose to be useful. In this paper, we exploit the special structure of ReLU networks and provide two computationally efficient algorithms (**Fast-Lin** and **Fast-Lip**) that are able to certify non-trivial lower bounds of minimum distortions, by bounding the ReLU units with appropriate linear functions (**Fast-Lin**), or by bounding the local Lipschitz constant (**Fast-Lip**). Experiments show that (1) our proposed methods deliver bounds close to (the gap is 2-3X) exact minimum distortion found by Reluplex in small MNIST networks while our algorithms are more than 10,000 times faster; (2) our methods deliver similar quality of bounds (the gap is within 35% and usually around 10%; sometimes our bounds are even better) for larger networks compared to the methods based on solving linear programming problems but our algorithms are 33-14,000 times faster; (3) our method is capable of solving large MNIST and CIFAR networks up to 7 layers with more than 10,000 neurons within tens of seconds on a single CPU core.

In addition, we show that, in fact, there is no polynomial time algorithm that can approximately find the minimum  $\ell_1$  adversarial distortion of a ReLU network with a  $0.99 \ln n$  approximation ratio unless  $\text{NP}=\text{P}$ , where  $n$  is the number of neurons in the network.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Tsui-Wei Weng and Huan Zhang contributed equally.

<sup>†</sup>MIT, [tweng@mit.edu](mailto:tweng@mit.edu)

<sup>‡</sup>UC Davis, [ecezhang@ucdavis.edu](mailto:ecezhang@ucdavis.edu)

<sup>§</sup>MIT, [chenhg@mit.edu](mailto:chenhg@mit.edu)

<sup>¶</sup>Harvard University & UT-Austin, [zhaos@g.harvard.edu](mailto:zhaos@g.harvard.edu), part of the work done while hosted by Jelani Nelson.

<sup>||</sup>UC Davis, [chohsieh@ucdavis.edu](mailto:chohsieh@ucdavis.edu)

<sup>\*\*</sup>MIT, [boning@mtl.mit.edu](mailto:boning@mtl.mit.edu)

<sup>††</sup>UT-Austin, [inderjit@cs.utexas.edu](mailto:inderjit@cs.utexas.edu)

<sup>‡‡</sup>MIT, [dluca@mit.edu](mailto:dluca@mit.edu)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background and related work</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Solving the minimum adversarial distortion . . . . .	3
2.2	Existing methods of computing lower bounds of minimum distortion . . . . .	3
2.3	Hardness and approximation algorithms . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Robustness guarantees for ReLU networks</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Finding the minimum distortion with a $0.99 \ln n$ approximation ratio is hard . . . . .	5
3.2	ReLU network and activation patterns under perturbations . . . . .	5
3.3	Approach 1: Certified lower bounds via linear approximations . . . . .	6
3.3.1	Derivation of the output bounds via linear upper and lower bounds for ReLU . . . . .	6
3.3.2	Computing pre-ReLU activation bounds . . . . .	10
3.3.3	Deriving maximum certified lower bounds of minimum adversarial distortion . . . . .	10
3.4	Approach 2: Certified lower bounds via bounding the local Lipschitz constant . . . . .	10
3.4.1	A general upper bound of Lipschitz constant in $\ell_q$ norm . . . . .	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Experimental Results</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Hardness</b>	<b>25</b>
A.1	Definitions . . . . .	25
A.2	Background of the PCP theorem . . . . .	27
A.3	Warm-up . . . . .	27
A.4	Main result . . . . .	28
<b>B</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 3.5</b>	<b>30</b>
B.1	Upper bound . . . . .	30
B.2	Lower bound . . . . .	32
<b>C</b>	<b>Proof of Corollary 3.7</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>An alternative bound on the Lipschitz constant</b>	<b>34</b>

# 1 Introduction

Since the discovery of adversarial examples in deep neural network (DNN) image classifiers [SZS<sup>+</sup>13], researchers have successfully found adversarial examples in many machine learning tasks applied to different areas, including object detection [XWZ<sup>+</sup>17], image captioning [CZC<sup>+</sup>18], speech recognition [CANK17], malware detection [WGG<sup>+</sup>17] and reading comprehension [JL17]. Moreover, black-box attacks have also been shown to be possible, where an attacker can find adversarial examples without knowing the architecture and parameters of the DNN [CZS<sup>+</sup>17, PMG<sup>+</sup>17, LCLS17].

The existence of adversarial examples poses a huge threat to the application of DNNs in mission-critical tasks including security cameras, self-driving cars and aircraft control systems. Many researchers have thus proposed defensive or detection methods in order to increase the robustness of DNNs. Notable examples are defensive distillation [PMW<sup>+</sup>16], adversarial retraining/training [KGB17, MMS<sup>+</sup>18] and model ensembles [TKP<sup>+</sup>18, LCZH17]. Despite many published contributions that aim at increasing the robustness of DNNs, theoretical results are rarely given and there is no guarantee that the proposed defensive methods can reliably improve the robustness. Indeed, many of these defensive mechanism have been shown to be ineffective when more advanced attacks are proposed [CW17c, CW17a, CW17b, HWC<sup>+</sup>17].

The robustness of a DNN can be verified, for instance, by examining a neighborhood (typically, an  $\ell_2$  or  $\ell_\infty$  ball) near a data point  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . The idea is to find the largest ball with radius  $r_0$  that guarantees no points inside the neighborhood can ever change the classifier’s output. Typically,  $r_0$  can be found as follows: given  $R$ , a global optimization algorithm can be used to find an adversarial example within this ball. A bisection on  $R$  can then produce  $r_0$ . Reluplex [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] is one example that uses such a technique. It encodes a ReLU network into statements that can be solved by satisfiability modulo theory (SMT) and linear programming (LP) solvers. However, it takes hours or more to verify the robustness property of a single data point on a small feed-forward network with a total of 300 neurons. Furthermore it is computationally infeasible even on a small MNIST classifier. In general, verifying the robustness property of a ReLU network is NP-complete [KBD<sup>+</sup>17, SND18].

On the other hand, a lower bound  $\beta_L$  of radius  $r_0$  can be given, which guarantees that no examples within a ball with radius  $\beta_L$  can ever change the network classification outcome. [HA17] is a pioneering work on giving such a lower bound for neural networks that are continuously differentiable, although only a 2-layer MLP network with differentiable activation is investigated. [WZC<sup>+</sup>18] has extended the lower bound result to non-differentiable functions and proposed a sampling-based algorithm to estimate  $\beta_L$  via extreme value theory. Their approach is feasible for large state-of-the-art DNNs but the computed quantity is an estimate of  $\beta_L$  without certificates. Ideally, we would like to obtain a *certified*<sup>1</sup> and *non-trivial*<sup>2</sup>  $\beta_L$  that is reasonably close to  $r_0$  within *reasonable amount of computational time* – this is indeed the main motivation of this paper.

In this paper, we develop two fast algorithms for obtaining a *tight* and *certified* lower bound  $\beta_L$  on ReLU networks. In addition to the certified lower bounds, we also provide a complementary theoretical result to [KBD<sup>+</sup>17, SND18] by further showing there does not even exist a polynomial time algorithm that can approximately find the minimum adversarial distortion with guaranteed approximation ratio. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We fully exploit the ReLU networks to give two computationally efficient methods of computing *tighter* and *guaranteed* robustness lower bounds via (1) **linear** approximation on the ReLU units (see Theorem 3.5, Corollary 3.7, Algorithm 1 **Fast-Lin**) and (2) bounding network local **Lipschitz** constant (see Section 3.4, Algorithm 2 **Fast-Lip**). Unlike the per-layer operator-norm-based lower bounds which are often very loose (close to 0, as verified in our experiments)

<sup>1</sup>A certified lower bound guarantees that  $\beta_L \leq r_0$ .

<sup>2</sup>Note that a trivial  $\beta_L$  is 0, which is not useful.

for deep networks, our bounds are much closer to the upper bound given by the best adversarial examples, and thus can be used to evaluate the robustness of DNNs with theoretical guarantee.

- We show that the computational efficiency of our proposed method is at least *four orders of magnitude faster* than finding the exact minimum distortion (with Reluplex), and also around two orders of magnitude (or more) faster than linear programming (LP) based methods. For instance, we can compute a reasonable robustness lower bound within a minute for a ReLU network with up to 7 layers or over ten thousands neurons (This is so far the best available result in the literature to our best knowledge).
- We also show that there is no polynomial time algorithm that can find a lower bound of minimum  $\ell_1$  adversarial distortion with a  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$  approximation ratio (where  $n$  is the total number of neurons) unless  $\text{NP}=\text{P}$  (see Theorem 3.1).

**Roadmap.** We discussed some related works on solving the minimum adversarial distortion or finding a lower bound in Section 2. We present our two certified lower bounds (**Fast-Lin**, **Fast-Lip**) and hardness result in Section 3. We compare our algorithms with existing methods and show the experimental results in Section 4. Appendix A presents the full proof of our in-approximability result. Appendix B and C provide proofs of our guaranteed lower bounds. Appendix D provides an alternative method of bounding Lipschitz constant.

## 2 Background and related work

### 2.1 Solving the minimum adversarial distortion

For ReLU networks, the verification problem can be transformed into a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) problem [LM17, CNR17, FJ17] by using binary variables to encode the states of ReLU activation in each neuron. [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] proposed a satisfiable modulo theory (SMT) based framework, Reluplex, which also encodes the network into a set of linear constraints with special rules to handle ReLU activations. Reluplex uses a similar algorithm to Simplex, and it splits the problem into two linear programming (LP) problems based on a ReLU’s activation status on demand. Similarly, [Ehl17] proposed Planet, another splitting-based approach using satisfiability (SAT) solvers. All of these approaches can guarantee to find the exact minimum distortion of an adversarial example, and thus can be used for formal verification. However, because of the NP-hard nature of the underlying problem, these approaches can only be applied to very small networks. For example, using Reluplex to verify a feed-forward network with 5 inputs, 5 outputs and total 300 hidden neurons on a single data point can take a few hours [KBD<sup>+</sup>17].

### 2.2 Existing methods of computing lower bounds of minimum distortion

The earliest attempt in this line of work dates back to 2001 [Zak01], where the authors bound the approximation error between a trained neural network (with sigmoid or hyperbolic tangent activations) and a pre-defined multi-dimensional look-up table using second derivatives. [SZS<sup>+</sup>13] gives a lower bound on the minimum distortion in a ReLU network by investigating the product of the weight matrices operator norms, but this bound is usually too loose to be useful in practice, as pointed out in [HA17] and verified in our experiments (see Table 2). A tighter bound was given by [HA17] using local Lipschitz constant on a network with one hidden layer, but their approach requires the network to be continuously-differentiable, and thus cannot be directly applied to ReLU networks. The approach in [WZC<sup>+</sup>18] extends the lower bound guarantee in [HA17] to non-differentiable functions by Lipschitz continuity assumption, and shows promising results of

estimating lower bounds of large DNNs with ReLU activations via extreme value theory. The CLEVER score [WZC<sup>+</sup>18], which is the estimated lower bound, has been shown to be capable of reflecting relative robustness of different networks and is the first robustness metric that can scale to large ImageNet networks. As also shown in our experiments in Section 4, the CLEVER score is a good robustness estimate close to the true minimum distortion given by Reluplex, albeit without providing certificates. Recently, [KW17] proposes using a convex outer adversarial polytope to compute a certified lower bound in ReLU networks. They provide a convex relaxation on the MILP verification problem [LM17, CNR17, FJ17], which reduces MILP to a linear programming (LP) when the distortion is in  $\ell_\infty$  norm, and they propose to solve the dual of their relaxed LP problem for the sake of computational efficiency. They focus on  $\ell_\infty$  norm, which allows them to get layer-wise bounds by looking into the dual problem. It is also worth noting that Reluplex [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] can not deal with general  $\ell_p$  norms though it can find the minimum distortion in terms of  $\ell_\infty$  norm (and  $\ell_1$  is possible via an extension). To address this issue and motivated by the approach of convex outer polytope [KW17], we provide another convex approximation based on a neuron’s activation status, which enables fast computation of a certified lower bound. As we will show in Section 3.3, we can derive explicit output bounds that does not involve solving any expensive LP or its dual problems on-the-fly, and can be incorporated with binary search to give a *certified lower bound* efficiently. Our techniques allow computing certified lower bounds on large fully-connected networks with multiple layers on MNIST and CIFAR datasets, which current state-of-the-art techniques [KBD<sup>+</sup>17, KW17] do not seem able to handle.

### 2.3 Hardness and approximation algorithms

$\text{NP} \neq \text{P}$  is the most important and popular assumption in computational complexity in the last several decades. It can be used to show that the decision of the exact case of a question is hard. However, in several cases, solving one question approximately is much easier than solving one question exactly. For example, there is no polynomial time algorithm to solve the MAX-CUT problem, but there is a simple 0.5-approximation polynomial time algorithm. Previous works [KBD<sup>+</sup>17, SND18] show that there is no polynomial time algorithm to find the minimum adversarial distortion  $r_0$  exactly. Therefore, a natural question to ask is: does there exist a polynomial time algorithm to solve the robustness problem approximately? In other words, can we give a lower bound of  $r_0$  with a guaranteed approximation ratio?

From another perspective,  $\text{NP} \neq \text{P}$  only rules out the polynomial running time. Some problems might not even have a sub-exponential time algorithm. To rule out that, the most well-known assumption used is the “Exponential Time Hypothesis” [IPZ98]. The hypothesis states that 3SAT cannot be solved in sub-exponential time in the worst case. Another example is that while tensor rank calculation is NP-hard [Hås90], a recent work [SWZ17b] proved that there is no  $2^{o(n^{1-o(1)})}$  time algorithm to give a constant approximation of the rank of the tensor. There are also some stronger versions of the hypothesis than ETH, e.g., Strong ETH [IP01], Gap ETH [Din16, MR17], and average case ETH [Fei02, RSW16].

## 3 Robustness guarantees for ReLU networks

**Overview of our results.** We begin with a motivating theorem in Section 3.1 showing that there does NOT exist a polynomial time algorithm able to find the minimum adversarial distortion with a  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$  approximation ratio. We then introduce basic properties and notations in Section 3.2 and state our main results in Section 3.3 and 3.4, where we develop two approaches that guarantee to obtain a lower bound of minimum adversarial distortion. In Section 3.3, we first demonstrate a

general approach to *directly* derive the output bounds of a ReLU network with linear approximation when inputs are perturbed by a general  $\ell_p$  norm noise. The analytic output bounds allow us to numerically compute a *certified* lower bound of minimum distortion along with a binary search. In Section 3.4, we present another method to obtain a *certified* lower bound of minimum distortion by deriving upper bounds for the local Lipschitz constant. Both methods are highly efficient and allow fast computation of *certified* lower bounds on large ReLU networks.

### 3.1 Finding the minimum distortion with a $0.99 \ln n$ approximation ratio is hard

[KBD<sup>+</sup>17] shows that verifying robustness for a general ReLU network is NP-complete; in other words, there is no efficient (polynomial time) algorithm to find the exact minimum adversarial distortion. Here, we further show that even *approximately* finding the minimum adversarial distortion with a guaranteed approximation ratio can be hard. Suppose the  $\ell_p$  norm of the true minimum adversarial distortion is  $r_0$ , and a robustness verification program A gives a guarantee that no adversarial examples exist within an  $\ell_p$  ball of radius  $r$  ( $r$  is a lower bound of  $r_0$ ). The approximation ratio  $\alpha := \frac{r_0}{r} > 1$ . We hope that  $\alpha$  is close to 1 with a guarantee; for example, if  $\alpha$  is a constant regardless of the scale of the network, we can always be sure that  $r_0$  is at most  $\alpha$  times as large as the lower bound  $r$  found by A. Here we relax this requirement and allow the approximation ratio to increase with the number of neurons  $n$ . In other words, when  $n$  is larger, the approximation becomes more inaccurate, but this “inaccuracy” can be bounded. However, the following theorem shows that no efficient algorithms exist to give a  $0.99 \ln n$  approximation in the special case of  $\ell_1$  robustness:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Unless  $P = NP$ , there is no polynomial time algorithm that gives  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation to the  $\ell_1$  ReLU robustness verification problem with  $n$  neurons.*

Our proof is based on a well-known in-approximability result of SET-COVER problem [RS97, AMS06, DS14] and a novel reduction from SET-COVER to our problem. We defer the proof into Appendix A. The formal definition of the  $\ell_1$  ReLU robustness verification problem can be found in Definition A.7. Theorem 3.1 implies that any efficient (polynomial time) algorithm cannot give better than  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation guarantee.

By making stronger assumptions of ETH([IPZ98]) and PGC(see [Mos12]), we can state an explicit result about running time,

**Corollary 3.2.** *Under the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) and Projection Games Conjecture (PGC), there is no  $2^{o(n^c)}$  time algorithm that gives  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation to the  $\ell_1$  ReLU robustness verification problem with  $n$  neurons, where  $c \in (0, 1)$  is some fixed constant.*

### 3.2 ReLU network and activation patterns under perturbations

Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$  be the input vector for an  $m$ -layer neural network with  $m - 1$  hidden layers and let the number of neurons in each layer be  $n_k, \forall k \in [m]$ . We use  $[n]$  to denote set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The weight matrix  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$  and bias vector  $\mathbf{b}^{(k)}$  for the  $k$ -th layer have dimension  $n_k \times n_{k-1}$  and  $n_k$ , respectively. Let  $\phi_k : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_k}$  be the operator mapping from input layer to layer  $k$  and  $\sigma(\mathbf{y})$  be the coordinate-wise activation function; for each  $k \in [m - 1]$ , the relation between layer  $k - 1$  and layer  $k$  can be written as

$$\phi_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\mathbf{W}^{(k)} \phi_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}^{(k)}), \text{ where } \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times n_{k-1}}, \mathbf{b}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k}.$$

For the input layer and the output layer, we have  $\phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$  and  $\phi_m(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}^{(m)} \phi_{m-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}^{(m)}$ . The output of the neural network is  $f(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_m(\mathbf{x})$ , which is a vector of length  $n_m$ , and the  $j$ -th




Figure 1: If the input of a ReLU unit is between  $[l, u]$ , the output of ReLU’s output can be upper and lower bounded linearly. Notably, our proposed linear lower bounds (c) has the same slope as the upper bound, allowing an elegant derivation through multiple layers (see Section 3.3.1)

output is its  $j$ -th coordinate, denoted as  $f_j(\mathbf{x}) = [\phi_m(\mathbf{x})]_j$ . For ReLU activation, the activation function  $\sigma(\mathbf{y}) = \max(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{0})$  is an element-wise operation on the input vector  $\mathbf{y}$ .

Given an input data point  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$  and a bounded  $\ell_p$ -norm perturbation  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , the input  $\mathbf{x}$  is constrained in an  $\ell_p$  ball  $B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon) := \{\mathbf{x} \mid \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\|_p \leq \epsilon\}$ . With all possible perturbations in  $B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ , the pre-ReLU activation of each neuron has a lower and upper bound  $l \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $l \leq u$ . Let us use  $\mathbf{l}_r^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_r^{(k)}$  to denote the lower and upper bound for the  $r$ -th neuron in the  $k$ -th layer, and let  $\mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}$  be its pre-ReLU activation, where  $\mathbf{z}_r^{(k)} = \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(k)} \phi_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_r^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} \leq \mathbf{z}_r^{(k)} \leq \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)}$ , and  $\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(k)}$  is the  $r$ -th row of  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$ . There are three categories of possible activation patterns and we use  $\mathcal{I}_k^+, \mathcal{I}_k^-$  and  $\mathcal{I}_k$  to denote the sets of  $k$ -th layer neurons that fit the categories (i)-(iii) respectively:

- (i) the neuron is always activated  $\iff \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} \geq \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} \geq 0 \iff \forall \mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon), \sigma(\mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}) = \mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}$ ,
- (ii) the neuron is always inactivated  $\iff \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} \leq \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} \leq 0 \iff \forall \mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon), \sigma(\mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}) = 0$ ,
- (iii) the neuron could be either activated or inactivated  $\iff \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} < 0 < \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} \iff \sigma(\mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}) = 0 \text{ or } \mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}$ .

The formal definition of  $\mathcal{I}_k^+, \mathcal{I}_k^-$  and  $\mathcal{I}_k$  is

$$\mathcal{I}_k^+ = \{r \in [n_k] \mid \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} \geq \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} \geq 0\}, \mathcal{I}_k^- = \{r \in [n_k] \mid \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} \leq \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} \leq 0\}, \mathcal{I}_k = \{r \in [n_k] \mid \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} < 0 < \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)}\},$$

Obviously,  $\{\mathcal{I}_k^+, \mathcal{I}_k^-, \mathcal{I}_k\}$  is a partition of set  $[n_k]$ .

### 3.3 Approach 1: Certified lower bounds via linear approximations

#### 3.3.1 Derivation of the output bounds via linear upper and lower bounds for ReLU

In this section, we propose a methodology to *directly* derive upper bounds and lower bounds of the output of an  $m$ -layer feed-forward ReLU network. The central idea is to derive an *explicit* upper/lower bound based on the linear approximations for the neurons in category (iii) and the signs of the weights associated with the activations. Although the idea of using linear approximations is similar to [KW17], our technique is different in three aspects. First, we show that it is possible to *derive explicit output bounds* and do not need to solve any relaxed linear program or its dual. Second, our framework can easily handle *general*  $\ell_p$  constrained adversarial distortions and we demonstrate full results for general  $\ell_p$  ( $p = 1, 2, \infty$ ) distortions on both MNIST and CIFAR networks in Section 4. Lastly, though our technique can work with more general convex approximations, we focus on a specific linear approximation bounds to ReLU (see Figure 1c) different from [KW17] (see Figure 1b) and show the adopted linear bounds is beneficial to efficient computation in large networks. Figure 2 illustrates the idea of our proposed method.






Figure 2: Illustration of deriving output bounds for ReLU networks in Section 3.3. The final output upper bounds ( $f_j^U$ ) and lower bounds ( $f_j^L$ ) can be derived by considering the activation status of the neurons with input perturbation  $\|\delta\|_p \leq \epsilon$ . For neurons in  $\mathcal{I}_k^+$ , their outputs are identical to their inputs; for neurons in  $\mathcal{I}_k^-$ , they can be removed during computation as their outputs are always zero; for neurons in  $\mathcal{I}_k$ , their outputs can be bounded by corresponding linear upper bounds and lower bounds considering the signs of associated weights.

We start with a 2-layers network and then extend it to  $m$  layers. The  $j$ -th output of a 2-layer network is:

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1^+, \mathcal{I}_1^-, \mathcal{I}_1} \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) + \mathbf{b}_j^{(2)}.$$

For neurons in category (i), i.e.,  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1^+$ , we have  $\sigma(\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) = \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}$ ; for neurons in category (ii), i.e.,  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1^-$ , we have  $\sigma(\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) = 0$ . For the neurons in category (iii), [KW17] uses the following convex outer bounds to replace the ReLU activation  $\sigma(y)$  (illustrated in Figure 1b):

$$0 \leq \sigma(y), y \leq \sigma(y), \sigma(y) \leq \frac{u}{u-l}(y-l), \quad (1)$$

where  $l$  and  $u$  are the lower bound and upper bound of the pre-ReLU activation of the neuron (i.e. we can think of  $y = \mathbf{z}_r^{(k)}$ ,  $u = \mathbf{u}_r^{(k)}$ ,  $l = \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{I}_k$ ). If this approximation is applied, then for  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1$  the following holds with  $\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} := \frac{\mathbf{u}_r^{(1)}}{\mathbf{u}_r^{(1)} - \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)}}$ :

$$0 \leq \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) \leq \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)} - \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)}). \quad (2)$$

In our approach, we propose to use a *different convex lower bound* for the ReLU function, which replaces the lower bound 0 of  $\sigma(y)$  in (1) by  $\frac{u}{u-l}y$  (illustrated in Figure 1b):

$$\frac{u}{u-l}y \leq \sigma(y) \leq \frac{u}{u-l}(y-l). \quad (3)$$

When (3) is used, then the LHS of (2) will be replaced by  $\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)})$ :

$$\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) \leq \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) \leq \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)} - \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)}). \quad (4)$$

Note that unlike (2), the only difference between the LHS and RHS in (4) is the term  $-\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)}$ . To obtain an upper bound and lower bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$  with (3), set  $\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} = \frac{\mathbf{u}_r^{(1)}}{\mathbf{u}_r^{(1)} - \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)}}$  for  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1$  and



$\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} = 1$  for  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1^+$ , and we have

$$f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1^+, \mathcal{I}_1} \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1, \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(2)}, \quad (5)$$

$$f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1^+, \mathcal{I}_1} \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)}) - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1, \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} \mathbf{l}_r^{(1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(2)}, \quad (6)$$

where  $f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^U(\mathbf{x})$ . To obtain this upper bound  $f_j^U(\mathbf{x})$ , we take the upper bound of  $\sigma(\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)})$  for  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1, \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} > 0$  and its lower bound for  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1, \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \leq 0$ . Both cases share a common term of  $\mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} (\mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_r^{(1)})$ , which is combined into the first summation term in (5) with  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1$ . Similarly we get the bound for  $f_j^L(\mathbf{x})$ .

We note that this technique also works for other linear upper and lower bounds. For example, we can also obtain  $f_j^U(\mathbf{x})$  and  $f_j^L(\mathbf{x})$  using (1) by considering the signs of  $\mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)}$ . However, our linear approximation (3) gives additional benefits on computational efficiency especially when we extend the bounds to multiple layers. Because (3) has the same slope on both sides, the multiplier  $\mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{d}_r^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)}$  before  $\mathbf{x}$  in (5) and (6) are the same regardless of the sign of  $\mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)}$ . This is *crucial* to efficient computation for multiple layers, as we will be able to recursively compute the multiplier before  $\mathbf{x}$  efficiently. On the other hand, the approximation (1) does not exhibit such a good property.

For a general  $m$ -layer ReLU network with the linear approximation (3), we will show in Theorem 3.5 that the network output can be bounded by two explicit functions when the input  $\mathbf{x}$  is perturbed with a  $\epsilon$ -bounded  $\ell_p$  noise. We start by defining the activation matrix  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)}$  and the additional equivalent bias terms  $\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{H}^{(k)}$  for the  $k$ -th layer in Definition 3.3 and the two explicit functions in 3.4.

**Definition 3.3** ( $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}, \mathbf{T}^{(k)}, \mathbf{H}^{(k)}$ ). Given matrices  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times n_{k-1}}$  and vectors  $\mathbf{b}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k}, \forall k \in [m]$ . We define  $\mathbf{D}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0}$  as an identity matrix. For each  $k \in [m-1]$ , we define matrix  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times n_k}$  as follows

$$\mathbf{D}_{r,r}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{u}_r^{(k)}}{\mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} - \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)}} & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}; \\ 1 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k^+; \\ 0 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k^-. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We define matrix  $\mathbf{A}^{(m-1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_m \times n_{m-1}}$  to be  $\mathbf{W}^{(m)} \mathbf{D}^{(m-1)}$ , and for each  $k \in \{m-1, m-2, \dots, 1\}$ , matrix  $\mathbf{A}^{(k-1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_m \times n_{k-1}}$  is defined recursively as

$$\mathbf{A}^{(k-1)} = \mathbf{A}^{(k)} \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{D}^{(k-1)}.$$

For each  $k \in [m-1]$ , we define matrices  $\mathbf{T}^{(k)}, \mathbf{H}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times n_m}$ , where

$$\mathbf{T}_{r,j}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k, \mathbf{A}_{j,r}^{(k)} > 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{r,j}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k, \mathbf{A}_{j,r}^{(k)} < 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Definition 3.4** (Two explicit functions :  $f^U(\cdot)$  and  $f^L(\cdot)$ ). Let matrices  $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{H}^{(k)}$  be defined as Definition 3.3. We define two functions  $f^U, f^L : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  as follows. For each input vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}), \\ f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to state our main theorem,

**Theorem 3.5** (Two side bounds with explicit functions). Given an  $m$ -layer ReLU neural network function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$ , there exists two explicit functions  $f^L : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  and  $f^U : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  (see Definition 3.4) such that  $\forall j \in [n_m], \forall \mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ ,

$$f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^U(\mathbf{x}).$$

The proof of Theorem 3.5 is in Appendix B. Since the input  $\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ , we can maximize (5) and minimize (6) within this set to obtain a global upper and lower bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$ , which has analytic solutions for any  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  and the result is formally shown in Corollary 3.7 with the proof in Appendix C. In other words, we have *analytic* bounds that can be computed efficiently without resorting to any optimization solvers for general  $\ell_p$  distortion, and this is the key to enable fast computation for layer-wise output bounds.

We first formally define the global upper bound  $\gamma_j^U$  and lower bound  $\gamma_j^L$  of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$ ,

**Definition 3.6** ( $\gamma_j^L, \gamma_j^U$ ). Given a point  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ , a neural network function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$ , parameters  $p, \epsilon$ . Let matrices  $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{H}^{(k)}$ ,  $\forall k \in [m-1]$  be defined as Definition 3.3. For each  $j \in [n_m]$ , we define  $\gamma_j^L, \gamma_j^U$  as

$$\gamma_j^L = \mu_j^- + \nu_j - \epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q \text{ and } \gamma_j^U = \mu_j^+ + \nu_j + \epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q,$$

where  $q$  satisfy  $1/p + 1/q = 1$  and  $\nu_j, \mu_j^+, \mu_j^-$  are defined as

$$\mu_j^+ = - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}, \quad (8)$$

$$\mu_j^- = - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}, \quad (9)$$

$$\nu_j = \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{b}^{(k)}. \quad (10)$$

Using Theorem 3.5 and Definition 3.6, we can obtain the following corollary,

**Corollary 3.7** (Two side bounds in closed-form). Given a point  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ , an  $m$ -layer neural network function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$ , parameters  $p$  and  $\epsilon$ . For each  $j \in [n_m]$ , there exist two fixed values  $\gamma_j^L$  and  $\gamma_j^U$  (see Definition 3.6) such that  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ ,

$$\gamma_j^L \leq f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq \gamma_j^U.$$

### 3.3.2 Computing pre-ReLU activation bounds

Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.7 give us a global lower bound  $\gamma_j^L$  and upper bound  $\gamma_j^U$  of the  $j$ -th neuron at the  $m$ -th layer if we know all the pre-ReLU activation bounds  $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(k)}$ , from layer 1 to  $m - 1$ , as the construction of  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$  requires  $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(k)}$  (see Definition 3.3). Here, we show how this can be done easily and layer-by-layer. We start from  $m = 1$  where  $\mathbf{A}^{(0)} = \mathbf{W}^{(1)}$ ,  $f^U(\mathbf{x}) = f^L(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}^{(0)}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^{(1)}$ . Then, we can apply Corollary 3.7 to get the output bounds of each neuron and set them as  $\mathbf{l}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$ . Then, we can proceed to  $m = 2$  with  $\mathbf{l}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$  and compute the output bounds of second layer by Corollary 3.7 and set them as  $\mathbf{l}^{(2)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(2)}$ . Repeating this procedure for all  $m - 1$  layers, we will get all the  $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(k)}$  needed to compute the output range of the  $m$ -th layer.

Note that when computing  $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(k)}$ , the constructed  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\mathbf{D}^{(k-1)}$  can be saved and reused for bounding the next layer, which facilitates efficient implementations. Moreover, the time complexity of computing the output bounds of an  $m$ -layer ReLU network with Theorem 3.5 and Corollary 3.7 is *polynomial* time in contrast to the approaches in [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] and [LM17] where SMT solvers and MIO solvers have *exponential* time complexity. The major computation cost is to form  $\mathbf{A}^{(0)}$  for the  $m$ -th layer, which involves multiplications of layer weights in a *similar cost of forward propagation*.

### 3.3.3 Deriving maximum certified lower bounds of minimum adversarial distortion

Suppose  $c$  is the predicted class of the input data point  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and the targeted attack class is  $j$ . With Theorem 3.5, the maximum possible lower bound for the targeted attacks  $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$  and un-targeted attacks  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  are

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_j = \max_{\epsilon} \epsilon \text{ s.t. } \gamma_c^L(\epsilon) - \gamma_j^U(\epsilon) > 0 \text{ and } \tilde{\epsilon} = \min_{j \neq c} \tilde{\epsilon}_j.$$

Though it is hard to get analytic forms of  $\gamma_c^L(\epsilon)$  and  $\gamma_j^U(\epsilon)$  in terms of  $\epsilon$ , fortunately, we can still obtain  $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$  via binary search. This is because Corollary 3.7 allows us to efficiently compute the numerical values of  $\gamma_c^L(\epsilon)$  and  $\gamma_j^U(\epsilon)$  given  $\epsilon$ . It is worth noting that we can further improve the bound by considering  $g(\mathbf{x}) := f_c(\mathbf{x}) - f_j(\mathbf{x})$  at the last layer and apply the same procedure to compute the lower bound of  $g(\mathbf{x})$  (denoted as  $\tilde{\gamma}^L$ ); this can be done easily by redefining the last layer's weights to be a row vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} := \mathbf{W}_{c,:}^{(m)} - \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(m)}$ . The corresponding maximum possible lower bound for the targeted attacks is  $\tilde{\epsilon}_j = \max \epsilon \text{ s.t. } \tilde{\gamma}^L(\epsilon) > 0$ . Our proposed algorithm, **Fast-Lin**, is shown in Algorithm 1.

## 3.4 Approach 2: Certified lower bounds via bounding the local Lipschitz constant

[WZC<sup>+</sup>18] shows a non-trivial lower bound of minimum adversarial distortion for an input example  $\mathbf{x}_0$  in targeted attacks is  $\min \left( g(\mathbf{x}_0) / L_{q,x_0}^j, \epsilon \right)$ , where  $g(\mathbf{x}) = f_c(\mathbf{x}) - f_j(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $L_{q,x_0}^j$  is the local Lipschitz constant of  $g(\mathbf{x})$  in  $B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ ,  $j$  is the target class,  $c$  is the original class, and  $1/p + 1/q = 1$ . For un-targeted attacks, the lower bound can be presented in a similar form. [WZC<sup>+</sup>18] uses sampling techniques to estimate the local Lipschitz constant and compute a lower bound without certificates.

Here, we propose a new algorithm to compute a *certified* lower bound of the minimum adversarial distortion by upper bounding the local Lipschitz constant with guarantees. To start with, let us rewrite the relations of subsequent layers in the following form:  $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(k)}(\mathbf{W}^{(k)}\phi_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}^{(k)})$ , where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is replaced by the diagonal activation pattern matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(k)}$  that encodes the status of

---

**Algorithm 1 Fast Bounding via Linear Upper/Lower Bounds for ReLU (Fast-Lin)**


---

**Require:** weights and biases of  $m$  layers:  $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{W}^{(m)}, \mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{(m)}$ , original class  $c$ , target class  $j$

```

1: procedure FAST-LIN( $\mathbf{x}_0, p, \epsilon_0$ )
2:   Replace the last layer weights  $\mathbf{W}^{(m)}$  with a row vector  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{c,:}^{(m)} - \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(m)}$  (see Section 3.3.3)
3:   Initial  $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon_0$ 
4:   while  $\epsilon$  has not achieved a desired accuracy and iteration limit has not reached do
5:      $\mathbf{l}^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}^{(0)} \leftarrow$  don't care
6:     for  $k \leftarrow 1$  to  $m$  do  $\triangleright$  Compute lower and upper bounds for ReLU units for all  $m$  layers
7:        $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}^{(k)} \leftarrow$  COMPUTETWOSIDEBOUNDS( $\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon, p, \mathbf{l}^{(1:k-1)}, \mathbf{u}^{(1:k-1)}, k$ )
8:       if  $\mathbf{l}^{(m)} > 0$  then  $\triangleright \mathbf{l}^{(m)}$  is a scalar since the last layer weight is a row vector
9:          $\epsilon$  is a lower bound; increase  $\epsilon$  using a binary search procedure
10:      else
11:         $\epsilon$  is not a lower bound; decrease  $\epsilon$  using a binary search procedure
12:       $\tilde{\epsilon}_j \leftarrow \epsilon$ 
13:      return  $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$   $\triangleright \tilde{\epsilon}_j$  is a certified lower bound  $\beta_L$ 

14: procedure COMPUTETWOSIDEBOUNDS( $\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon, p, \mathbf{l}^{(1:m'-1)}, \mathbf{u}^{(1:m'-1)}, m'$ )
15:    $\triangleright \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$  : input data vector,  $p$  :  $\ell_p$  norm,  $\epsilon$  : maximum  $\ell_p$ -norm perturbation
16:    $\triangleright \mathbf{l}^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}, k \in [m']$  : layer-wise bounds
17:   if  $m' = 1$  then  $\triangleright$  Step 1: Form  $\mathbf{A}$  matrices
18:      $\mathbf{A}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}^{(1)}$   $\triangleright$  First layer bounds do not depend on  $\mathbf{l}^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}^{(0)}$ 
19:   else
20:     for  $k \leftarrow m' - 1$  to 1 do
21:       if  $k = m' - 1$  then  $\triangleright$  Construct  $\mathbf{D}^{(m'-1)}, \mathbf{A}^{(m'-1)}, \mathbf{H}^{(m'-1)}, \mathbf{T}^{(m'-1)}$ 
22:         Construct diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_k \times n_k}$  using  $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}^{(k)}$  according to Eq. (7).
23:          $\mathbf{A}^{(m'-1)} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}^{(m')} \mathbf{D}^{(m'-1)}$ 
24:       else  $\triangleright$  Multiply all saved  $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$  by  $\mathbf{A}^{(m'-1)}$ 
25:          $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}^{(m'-1)} \mathbf{A}^{(k)}$   $\triangleright$  We save  $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$  for next function call
26:          $\mathbf{T}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$   $\triangleright$  Initialize  $\mathbf{T}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{H}^{(k)}$ 
27:         for all  $r \in \mathcal{I}_k$  do
28:           for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n_k$  do
29:             if  $\mathbf{A}_{j,r}^{(k)} > 0$  then
30:                $\mathbf{T}_{r,j}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)}$ 
31:             else
32:                $\mathbf{H}_{r,j}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)}$ 
33:       for  $j = 1$  to  $n_{m'}$  do  $\triangleright$  Step 2: Compute  $\gamma^U$  and  $\gamma^L$ 
34:          $\nu_j \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m')}, \mu_j^+ \leftarrow 0, \mu_j^- \leftarrow 0$   $\triangleright$  Initialize  $\nu_j, \mu_j^+, \mu_j^-$ 
35:         for  $k = 1$  to  $m' - 1$  do  $\triangleright$  This loop is skipped when  $m' = 1$ 
36:            $\mu_j^+ \leftarrow \mu_j^+ - \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}$   $\triangleright$  According to Eq. (8)
37:            $\mu_j^- \leftarrow \mu_j^- - \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}$   $\triangleright$  According to Eq. (9)
38:            $\nu_j \leftarrow \nu_j + \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{b}^{(k)}$   $\triangleright$  According to Eq. (10)
39:          $\triangleright \nu_j, \mu_j^+, \mu_j^-$  satisfy Definition 3.6
40:          $\gamma_j^U \leftarrow \mu_j^+ + \nu_j + \epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q$ 
41:          $\gamma_j^L \leftarrow \mu_j^- + \nu_j - \epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q$   $\triangleright$  Definition 3.6
42:       return  $\gamma^L, \gamma^U$ 

```

---

neurons  $r$  in  $k$  th layer:

$$\Lambda_{r,r}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ or } 0 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k \\ 1 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \\ 0 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k^- \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and  $\Lambda^{(m)} = \mathbf{I}_{n_m}$ . With a slight abuse of notation, let us define  $\Lambda_a^{(k)}$  as a diagonal activation matrix for neurons in the  $k$ -th layer who are always **activated**, i.e. the  $r$ -th diagonal is 1 if  $r \in \mathcal{I}_k^+$  and 0 otherwise, and  $\Lambda_u^{(k)}$  as the diagonal activation matrix for  $k$  th layer neurons whose status are **uncertain**, i.e. the  $r$ -th diagonal is 1 or 0 (to be determined) if  $r \in \mathcal{I}_k$ , and 0 otherwise. Therefore, we have  $\Lambda^{(k)} = \Lambda_a^{(k)} + \Lambda_u^{(k)}$ . We can obtain  $\Lambda^{(k)}$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$  by applying Algorithm 1 and check the lower and upper bounds for each neuron  $r$  in layer  $k$ .

### 3.4.1 A general upper bound of Lipschitz constant in $\ell_q$ norm

The central idea is to compute upper bounds of  $L_{q,\mathbf{x}_0}^j$  by exploiting the three categories of activation patterns in ReLU networks when the allowable inputs are in  $B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ .  $L_{q,\mathbf{x}_0}^j$  can be defined as the maximum directional derivative as shown in [WZC<sup>+</sup>18]. The maximum directional derivative in a ball is the same as maximum gradient norm,  $\max_{\mathbf{x}} \|\nabla g(\mathbf{x})\|_q$  in a ball. For the ReLU network, the maximum gradient norm can be found by examining all the possible activation patterns and take the one (the worst-case) that results in the largest gradient norm. However, as all possible activation patterns grow exponentially with the number of the neurons, it is impossible to examine all of them in brute-force. Fortunately, computing the worst-case pattern on each element of  $\nabla g(\mathbf{x})$  (i.e.  $[\nabla g(\mathbf{x})]_k$ ,  $k \in [n_0]$ ) is much easier and more efficient. In addition, we apply a simple fact that the maximum norm of a vector (which is  $\nabla g(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$  in our case) is upper bounded by the norm of the maximum value for each components. By computing the worst-case pattern on  $[\nabla g(\mathbf{x})]_k$  and the norm, we can obtain an *upper bound of the local Lipschitz constant*, which results in a *certified lower bound of minimum distortion*.<sup>3</sup>

Below, we first show how to derive an upper bound of the Lipschitz constant by computing the worst-case activation pattern on  $[\nabla g(\mathbf{x})]_k$  for 2 layers. Next, we will show how to apply it repeatedly for a general  $m$ -layer network. Note that for simplicity, we will use  $[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k$  to illustrate our derivation; however, it is easy to extend to  $[\nabla g(\mathbf{x})]_k$  as  $g(\mathbf{x}) = f_c(\mathbf{x}) - f_j(\mathbf{x})$ . Thus, the result for  $[\nabla g(\mathbf{x})]_k$  is simply the result of  $[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k$  but replacing the last layer weight vector  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(m)}$  by  $(\mathbf{W}_{c,:}^{(m)} - \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(m)})$ .

**Bounds for 2 layers: the base case.** The gradient for a 2-layer ReLU network is the following:

$$[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k = \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \Lambda_a^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \Lambda_u^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}.$$

The first term  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \Lambda_a^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}$  is a constant and all we need to bound is the second term  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \Lambda_u^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(1)} = \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \Lambda_a^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{j,k}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{j,k}^{(1)}$  be the lower and upper bounds of the second term, we

<sup>3</sup>We can use the triangle inequality to derive an upper bound on the Lipschitz constant (see Appendix D), but this bound is loose as the activation patterns on the neurons are not exploited.

have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{L}_{j,k}^{(1)} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}_{i,k}^{(2)} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}_{i,k}^{(2)}, \\ \mathbf{U}_{j,k}^{(1)} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}_{i,k}^{(2)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}_{i,k}^{(2)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\max_{\mathbf{x}} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k| \leq \max(|\mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{L}_{j,k}^{(1)}|, |\mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{U}_{j,k}^{(1)}|)$ .

**Bounds for 3 layers or more.** For 3 or more layers, we can apply the above 2-layer results recursively, layer-by-layer. For example, for a 3-layer ReLU network,

$$[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k = \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}.$$

If we let  $\mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)} = \mathbf{W}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ , then  $[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k$  is reduced to the following form that is similar to 2 layers:

$$[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k = \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} \mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)} \quad (12)$$

$$= \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(2)} \mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(2)} \mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)} \quad (13)$$

To obtain the bound in (12), we first need to obtain a lower bound and upper bound of  $\mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ , where we can directly apply the 2-layer results to get an upper and an lower bound for each component  $i$  as  $\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k}^{(1)} \leq \mathbf{Y}_{i,k}^{(1)} \leq \mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k}^{(1)}$ . Next, the first term  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(2)} \mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)}$  in (13) can be lower bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2^+, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k}^{(1)}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2^-, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k}^{(1)}) \quad (14)$$

and upper bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2^+, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k}^{(1)}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2^-, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k}^{(1)}) \quad (15)$$

whereas the second term  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(2)} \mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)}$  in (13) can be lower bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k}^{(1)}) < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k}^{(1)}) \quad (16)$$

and upper bounded by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k}^{(1)}) > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} (\mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k}^{(1)}). \quad (17)$$

Let  $\mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2^+} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}^{(3)} \mathbf{C}_{i,k}^{(1)}$ , and let  $\mathbf{U}_{j,k}^{(2)} + \mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)}$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{j,k}^{(2)} + \mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)}$  be the upper and lower bound of  $[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k$ , we have

$$\mathbf{U}_{j,k}^{(2)} + \mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)} = (15) + (17) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}_{j,k}^{(2)} + \mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)} = (14) + (16),$$

and  $\max_{\mathbf{x}} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k| \leq \max(|\mathbf{L}_{j,k}^{(2)} + \mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)}|, |\mathbf{U}_{j,k}^{(2)} + \mathbf{C}_{j,k}^{(2)}|)$ . Thus, this technique can be used iteratively to solve  $\max_{\mathbf{x}} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k|$  for a general  $m$ -layer network. We show the full procedure in Algorithm 2. After getting the maximum value of each individual component,  $\max_{\mathbf{x}} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k|$ , we can easily bound any  $p$  norm of  $\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})$  by the  $p$  norm of the vector of maximum values. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \|\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})\|_1 &\leq \sum_j \left\| \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k| \right\|_1, \\ \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \|\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{\sum_j \left( \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k| \right)^2}, \\ \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \|\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})\|_\infty &\leq \max_j \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} |[\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})]_k|. \end{aligned}$$

**Further speed-up.** Note that in the 3-layer example, we compute the bounds from right to left, i.e. we first get the bound of  $\mathbf{W}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ , and then bound  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} \mathbf{Y}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ . Similarly, we can compute the bounds from left to right – get the bounds of  $\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}^{(2)}$  first, and then bound  $\mathbf{Y}_{j,:}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{:,k}^{(1)}$ , where  $\mathbf{Y}_{j,:}^{(2)} = \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(3)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}^{(2)}$ . Since the dimension of the output ( $n_m$ , which is the number of classes; 10 for CIFAR/MNIST) is typically far less than the dimension of the input vector ( $n_0$ , 784 in MNIST and 3072 in CIFAR), computing the bounds from left to right is more efficient as the matrix  $\mathbf{Y}$  has a smaller dimension of  $n_m \times n_k$  rather than  $n_k \times n_0$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Fast Bounding via Upper Bounding Local Lipschitz Constant (**Fast-Lip**)

---

**Require:** Weights of  $m$  layers:  $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{W}^{(m)}$ , original class  $c$ , target class  $j$

- 1: **procedure** FAST-LIP( $\mathbf{x}_0, p, \epsilon$ )
  - 2:   Replace the last layer weights  $\mathbf{W}^{(m)}$  with a row vector  $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{c,:}^{(m)} - \mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(m)}$  (see Section 3.3.3)
  - 3:   Run FAST-LIN to find layer-wise bounds  $\mathbf{l}^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}^{(i)}$ , and form  $\mathcal{I}_i^+, \mathcal{I}_i^-, \mathcal{I}_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$
  - 4:    $\mathbf{C}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}^{(1)}, \mathbf{L}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{U}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$
  - 5:   **for**  $l \leftarrow 1$  to  $m - 1$  **do**
  - 6:      $\mathbf{C}^{(l)}, \mathbf{L}^{(l)}, \mathbf{U}^{(l)} = \text{BOUND LAYER GRAD}(\mathbf{C}^{(l-1)}, \mathbf{L}^{(l-1)}, \mathbf{U}^{(l-1)}, \mathbf{W}^{(l+1)}, n_{l+1}, \mathcal{I}_l^+, \mathcal{I}_l^-, \mathcal{I}_l)$
  - 7:      $\triangleright \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$  because the last layer is replaced with a row vector  $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$
  - 8:      $\mathbf{v} \leftarrow \max(|\mathbf{C}^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{L}^{(m-1)}|, |\mathbf{C}^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{U}^{(m-1)}|)$   $\triangleright$  All operations are element-wise;
  - 9:      $\tilde{\epsilon}_j \leftarrow \min(\frac{g(\mathbf{x}_0)}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_q}, \epsilon)$   $\triangleright q$  is the dual norm of  $p$ ,  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$
  - 10:    **return**  $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$   $\triangleright \tilde{\epsilon}_j$  is a certified lower bound  $\beta_L$ . We can also bisect  $\tilde{\epsilon}_j$  (omitted).
  - 11: **procedure** BOUND LAYER GRAD( $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}, n', \mathcal{I}^+, \mathcal{I}^-, \mathcal{I}$ )
  - 12:   **for**  $k \in [n_0]$  **do**  $\triangleright n_0$  is the dimension of  $\mathbf{x}_0$
  - 13:     **for**  $j \in [n']$  **do**
  - 14:        $\mathbf{C}'_{j,k} \leftarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^+} \mathbf{W}_{j,i} \mathbf{C}_{i,k}$
  - 15:        $\mathbf{U}'_{j,k} \leftarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \mathbf{W}_{j,i} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i} \mathbf{U}_{i,k} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \mathbf{W}_{j,i} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i} \mathbf{L}_{i,k} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}(\mathbf{C}_{i,k} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k}) > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}(\mathbf{C}_{i,k} + \mathbf{U}_{i,k})$
  - 16:        $\mathbf{L}'_{j,k} \leftarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \mathbf{W}_{j,i} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i} \mathbf{L}_{i,k} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \mathbf{W}_{j,i} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i} \mathbf{U}_{i,k} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, \mathbf{W}_{j,i}(\mathbf{C}_{i,k} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k}) < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,i}(\mathbf{C}_{i,k} + \mathbf{L}_{i,k})$
  - 17:    **return**  $\mathbf{C}', \mathbf{L}', \mathbf{U}'$
-



## 4 Experimental Results

In this section, we perform extensive experiments to evaluate the performance of our proposed two lower-bound based robustness certificates on networks with different sizes and networks trained with different defending techniques. We compare our proposed bounds with LP-based methods, Reluplex and various attack algorithms. The experimental results suggest that our proposed robustness certificates are of high qualities and are computationally efficient even in large networks up to 7 layers or more than 10,000 neurons. In particular, we show that

1. Our certified lower bounds (**Fast-Lin**, **Fast-Lip**) are close to (gap is only 2-3X) the exact minimum distortion computed by Reluplex for small networks (Reluplex is only feasible for networks with less 100 neurons for MNIST). Our algorithm is more than 10,000 times faster than Reluplex. See Table 1.
2. Our certified lower bounds (**Fast-Lin**, **Fast-Lip**) give similar quality (the gap is within 35%, and usually around 10%; sometimes our bounds are even better) compared with the LP-based methods (**LP**, **LP-Full**); however, our algorithm is 33 - 14,000 times faster. The LP-based methods are infeasible for networks with more than 4,000 neurons. See Table 1 and 2.
3. When the network goes larger and deeper, our proposed methods can still give reasonably good lower bounds comparing to the upper bounds founded by attack algorithms on large networks (Table 2).
4. For defended networks, especially for adversarial training [MMS<sup>+</sup>18], our methods give significantly higher bounds, validating the effectiveness of this defending method. Our algorithms can also be used for evaluating other defending techniques (Table 3).

Below, we give detailed descriptions on the methods that we compare in Table 1 and 2.

### Methods we compared in Table 1 and 2.

- **Fast-Lin**: Our proposed method of directly bounding network output via **linear** upper/lower bounds for ReLU, as discussed in Section 3.3 and Algorithm 1;
- **Fast-Lip**: Our proposed method based on bounding local **Lipschitz** constant, in Section 3.4 and Algorithm 2;
- **Reluplex**: Reluplex [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] is a satisfiability modulo theory (SMT) based solver which delivers a true minimum distortion, but it is very computationally expensive.
- **LP-Full**: The formulation is proposed by [KW17]. This variant solves **full** relaxed **LP** problems at *every* layer to give a final “adversarial polytope”. Similar to our proposed methods, it only gives a lower bound. We extend [KW17] to  $p = 2$  case, where the input constraint becomes quadratic and requires a quadratic constrained programming (QCP) solver, which is usually slower than LP solvers.
- **LP**: Similar to LP-full, but this variant solves only **one** LP problem for the full network at the output neurons and the layer-wise bounds for the neurons in hidden layers are solved by **Fast-Lin**. We also extend it to  $p = 2$  case with QCP constraints on the inputs.
- **Attacks**: Any successful adversarial example gives a valid *upper bound* for the minimum adversarial distortion. For larger networks where Reluplex is not feasible, we run adversarial attacks and obtain an upper bound of minimal adversarial distortions to compare with. We apply the  $\ell_2$  and  $\ell_\infty$  variants of Carlini and Wagner’s attack (CW) [CW17c] to find the best  $\ell_2$  and  $\ell_\infty$  distortions. We found that the CW  $\ell_\infty$  attack usually finds adversarial examples with smaller  $\ell_\infty$  distortions than using PGD (projected gradient descent). We use EAD [CSZ<sup>+</sup>18],

a Elastic-Net regularized attack, to find adversarial examples with small  $\ell_1$  distortions. We run CW  $\ell_2$  and  $\ell_\infty$  attacks for 3,000 iterations and EAD attacks for 2,000 iterations.

- **CLEVER**: CLEVER [WZC<sup>+</sup>18] is an attack-agnostic robustness score based on local Lipschitz constant estimation and provides an estimated lower-bound. It is capable of performing robustness evaluation for large-scale networks but is not a certified lower bound.
- **Op-norm**: Operator norms of weight matrices were first used in [SZS<sup>+</sup>13] to give a robustness lower bound. We compute the  $\ell_p$  induced norm of weight matrices of each layer and use their product as the global Lipschitz constant  $L_q^j$ . A valid lower bound is given by  $g(\mathbf{x}_0)/L_q^j$  (see Section 3.4). We only need to pre-compute the operator norms once for all the examples.

We use MNIST and CIFAR datasets and evaluate the performance of each method in MLP networks with up to 7 layers or over 10,000 neurons, which is the largest network size for non-trivial and guaranteed robustness verification to date. We use the same number of hidden neurons for each layer and denote a  $m$ -layer network with  $n$  hidden neurons in each layer as  $m \times [n]$ . Each network is trained with a grid search of learning rates from  $\{0.1, 0.05, 0.02, 0.01, 0.005\}$  and weight decays from  $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-7}, 10^{-8}\}$  and we select the network with the best validation accuracy. We consider both targeted and untargeted robustness under  $\ell_p$  distortions ( $p = 1, 2, \infty$ ); for targeted robustness, we consider three target classes: a random class, a least likely class and a runner-up class (the class with second largest probability). The reported average scores are an average of 100 images from the test set, with images classified wrongly skipped. Reported time is per image. We use binary search to find the certified lower bounds in **Fast-Lin**, **Fast-Lip**, **LP** and **LP-Full**, and the maximum number of iterations is set to 15.

We implement our algorithm using Python (with Numpy and Numba)<sup>4</sup>, while for the LP based method we use the highly efficient Gurobi commercial LP solver with Python Interface. All experiments are conducted in single thread mode (we disable the concurrent solver in Gurobi) on a Intel Xeon E5-2683v3 (2.0 GHz) CPU. Despite the inefficiency of Python, we still achieve two orders of magnitudes speedup compared with **LP**, while achieving a very similar lower bound. Our methods are automatically parallelized by Numba and can gain further speedups on a multi-core CPU, but we disabled this parallelization for a fair comparison to other methods.

In Table 1, we compare the lower bound  $\beta_L$  computed by each algorithm to the true minimum distortion  $r_0$  found by Reluplex. We are only able to verify 2 and 3 layer MNIST with 20 neurons per hidden layer within reasonable time using Reluplex. It is worth-noting that the input dimension (784) is very large compared to the network evaluated in [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] with only 5 inputs. Lower bounds found by **Fast-Lin** is very close to **LP**, and the gaps are within 2-3X from the true minimum distortion  $r_0$  found by Reluplex. The upper bound given by CW  $\ell_\infty$  are also very close to  $r_0$ .

In Table 2, we compare **Fast-Lin**, **Fast-Lip** with **LP** and **Op-norm** on larger networks with up to over ten thousands hidden neurons. **Fast-Lin** and **Fast-Lip** are significantly faster than **LP** and are able to verify much larger networks (**LP** becomes very slow to solve exactly on 4-layer MNIST with 4096 hidden neurons, and is infeasible for even larger CIFAR models). **Fast-Lin** achieves a very similar bound comparing with results of **LP** over all smaller models, but being *over two orders of magnitude faster*. In [KW17], the authors propose to solve **LP**’s dual problem in a best-effort manner to tackle its high computation cost, however this will only make its computed lower bounds more loose. With our proposed methods, we can directly obtain output bounds with the analytic expression and do not need to solve the dual problem inexactly as in [KW17]. Our bounds are shown to be close to the exact **LP** solutions.

We found that **Fast-Lin** scales better than **Fast-Lip** for deeper networks, as **Fast-Lin** usually provides a good bound even when the number of layers is large. For deeper networks, neurons in the

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/huanzhang12/CertifiedReLURobustness>

Table 1: Comparison of our proposed certified lower bounds **Fast-Lin** and **Fast-Lip**, the lower bounds found by **LP** and **LP-Full**, the lower bounds found by **CLEVER**, the exact minimum distortion found by **Reluplex**, and the upper bounds found by **Attack** algorithms (CW  $\ell_\infty$  for  $p = \infty$ , CW  $\ell_2$  for  $p = 2$ , and EAD for  $p = 1$ ) on 2, 3 layers toy MNIST networks with *only 20 neurons per layer*. Differences of lower bounds and speedup are measured on the two corresponding **bold** numbers in each row, representing the best answer from our proposed algorithms and LP based approaches. Reluplex is designed to verify  $\ell_\infty$  robustness so we omit its numbers for  $\ell_2$  and  $\ell_1$ . Note that *LP-full and Reluplex are very slow* and cannot scale to any practical networks, and the purpose of this table is to show how close our fast bounds are compared to the true minimum distortion provided by **Reluplex** and the bounds that are slightly tighter but very expensive (e.g. **LP-Full**).

Toy Networks			Average Magnitude of Distortions on 100 Images							
Network	$p$	Target	Certified Bounds				difference ours vs. LP (-Full)	Exact	Uncertified	
			Our bounds		[KW17]			Reluplex [KBD+17]	CLEVER [WZC+18]	Attacks CW/EAD
			Fast-Lin	Fast-Lip	LP	LP-Full				
MNIST $2 \times [20]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.0191</b>	0.0167	<b>0.0197</b>	0.0197	-3.0%	0.04145	0.0235	0.04384
		rand	<b>0.0309</b>	0.0270	<b>0.0319</b>	0.0319	-3.2%	0.07765	0.0428	0.08060
		least	<b>0.0448</b>	0.0398	<b>0.0462</b>	0.0462	-3.1%	0.11711	0.0662	0.1224
	2	runner-up	<b>0.3879</b>	0.3677	0.4811	<b>0.5637</b>	-31.2%	-	0.4615	0.64669
		rand	<b>0.6278</b>	0.6057	0.7560	<b>0.9182</b>	-31.6%	-	0.8426	1.19630
		least	<b>0.9105</b>	0.8946	1.0997	<b>1.3421</b>	-32.2%	-	1.315	1.88830
	1	runner-up	2.3798	<b>2.8086</b>	2.5932	<b>2.8171</b>	-0.3%	-	3.168	5.38380
		rand	3.9297	<b>4.8561</b>	4.2681	<b>4.6822</b>	+3.7%	-	5.858	11.4760
		least	5.7298	<b>7.3879</b>	6.2062	<b>6.8358</b>	+8.1%	-	9.250	19.5960
MNIST $3 \times [20]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.0158</b>	0.0094	0.0168	<b>0.0171</b>	-7.2%	0.04234	0.0223	0.04786
		rand	<b>0.0229</b>	0.0142	0.0241	<b>0.0246</b>	-6.9%	0.06824	0.0385	0.08114
		least	<b>0.0304</b>	0.0196	0.0319	<b>0.0326</b>	-6.9%	0.10449	0.0566	0.11213
	2	runner-up	<b>0.3228</b>	0.2142	0.3809	<b>0.4901</b>	-34.1%	-	0.4231	0.74117
		rand	<b>0.4652</b>	0.3273	0.5345	<b>0.7096</b>	-34.4%	-	0.7331	1.22570
		least	<b>0.6179</b>	0.4454	0.7083	<b>0.9424</b>	-34.4%	-	1.100	1.71090
	1	runner-up	<b>2.0189</b>	1.8819	2.2127	<b>2.5010</b>	-19.3%	-	2.950	6.13750
		rand	<b>2.8550</b>	2.8144	3.1000	<b>3.5740</b>	-20.1%	-	4.990	10.7220
		least	3.7504	<b>3.8043</b>	4.0434	<b>4.6967</b>	-19.0%	-	7.131	15.6850

(a) Comparison of bounds

Toy Networks			Average Running Time per Image					
Network	$p$	Target	Certified Bounds				Exact	Speedup ours vs. LP-(full)
			Our bounds		[KW17]		Reluplex	
			Fast-Lin	Fast-Lip	LP	LP-Full	[KBD <sup>+</sup> 17]	
MNIST $2 \times [20]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>3.09 ms</b>	3.49 ms	<b>217 ms</b>	1.74 s	134 s	70X
		rand	<b>3.25 ms</b>	5.53 ms	<b>234 ms</b>	1.93 s	38 s	72X
		least	<b>3.37 ms</b>	8.90 ms	<b>250 ms</b>	1.97 s	360 s	74X
	2	runner-up	<b>3.00 ms</b>	3.76 ms	1.10 s	<b>20.6 s</b>	-	6864X
		rand	<b>3.37 ms</b>	6.16 ms	1.20 s	<b>23.1 s</b>	-	6838X
		least	<b>3.29 ms</b>	9.89 ms	1.27 s	<b>26.4 s</b>	-	8021X
	1	runner-up	2.85 ms	<b>39.2 ms</b>	1.27 s	<b>16.1 s</b>	-	412X
		rand	3.32 ms	<b>54.8 ms</b>	1.59 s	<b>17.3 s</b>	-	316X
		least	3.46 ms	<b>68.1 ms</b>	1.74 s	<b>17.7 s</b>	-	260X
MNIST $3 \times [20]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>5.58 ms</b>	3.64 ms	253 ms	<b>6.12 s</b>	4.7 hrs	1096X
		rand	<b>6.12 ms</b>	5.23 ms	291 ms	<b>7.16 s</b>	11.6 hrs	1171X
		least	<b>6.62 ms</b>	7.06 ms	307 ms	<b>7.30 s</b>	12.6 hrs	1102X
	2	runner-up	<b>5.35 ms</b>	3.95 ms	1.22 s	<b>57.5 s</b>	-	10742X
		rand	<b>5.86 ms</b>	5.81 ms	1.27 s	<b>66.3 s</b>	-	11325X
		least	<b>5.94 ms</b>	7.55 ms	1.34 s	<b>77.3 s</b>	-	13016X
	1	runner-up	<b>5.45 ms</b>	39.6 ms	1.27 s	<b>75.0 s</b>	-	13763X
		rand	<b>5.56 ms</b>	52.9 ms	1.47 s	<b>82.0 s</b>	-	14742X
		least	6.07 ms	<b>65.9 ms</b>	1.68 s	<b>85.9 s</b>	-	1304X

(b) Comparison of time

Table 2: Comparison of our proposed certified lower bounds **Fast-Lin** and **Fast-Lip** with other lower bounds (**LP**, **Op-norm**, **CLEVER**) and upper bounds (**Attack** algorithms: CW for  $p = 2, \infty$ , EAD for  $p = 1$ ) on networks with 2-7 layers, where each layer has 1024 or 2048 nodes. Differences of lower bounds and speedup are measured on the two corresponding **bold** numbers in each row. Note that LP-full and Reluplex are *computationally infeasible* for all the networks reported here. Omitted numbers (“-”) indicate these methods are computationally infeasible for that network. For **Op-norm**, computation time for each image is negligible as the operator norms can be pre-computed.

Large Networks			Average Magnitude of Distortion on 100 Images						Average Running Time per Image				
Network	$p$	Target	Certified Bounds				diff ours vs. LP	Uncertified		Certified Bounds			Speedup ours vs. LP
			Our bounds		LP	Op-norm		CLEVER	Attacks	Our bounds		LP	
			Fast-Lin	Fast-Lip	[KW17]	[SZS+13]		[WZC+18]	CW/EAD	Fast-Lin	Fast-Lip	[KW17]	
MNIST $2 \times [1024]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.02256</b>	0.01802	<b>0.02493</b>	0.00159	-9.5%	0.0447	0.0856	<b>127 ms</b>	167 ms	<b>19.3 s</b>	151X
		rand	<b>0.03083</b>	0.02512	<b>0.03386</b>	0.00263	-8.9%	0.0708	0.1291	<b>156 ms</b>	219 ms	<b>20.8 s</b>	133X
		least	<b>0.03854</b>	0.03128	<b>0.04281</b>	0.00369	-10.0%	0.0925	0.1731	<b>129 ms</b>	377 ms	<b>22.2 s</b>	172X
	2	runner-up	<b>0.46034</b>	0.42027	<b>0.55591</b>	0.24327	-17.2%	0.8104	1.1874	<b>127 ms</b>	196 ms	<b>419 s</b>	3305X
		rand	<b>0.63299</b>	0.59033	<b>0.75164</b>	0.40201	-15.8%	1.2841	1.8779	<b>128 ms</b>	234 ms	<b>195 s</b>	1523X
		least	<b>0.79263</b>	0.73133	<b>0.94774</b>	0.56509	-16.4%	1.6716	2.4556	<b>163 ms</b>	305 ms	<b>156 s</b>	956X
	1	runner-up	2.78786	<b>3.46500</b>	<b>3.21866</b>	0.20601	+7.7%	4.5970	9.5295	117 ms	<b>1.17 s</b>	<b>38.9 s</b>	33X
		rand	3.88241	<b>5.10000</b>	<b>4.47158</b>	0.35957	+14.1%	7.4186	17.259	139 ms	<b>1.40 s</b>	<b>48.1 s</b>	34X
		least	4.90809	<b>6.36600</b>	<b>5.74140</b>	0.48774	+10.9%	9.9847	23.933	151 ms	<b>1.62 s</b>	<b>53.1 s</b>	33X
MNIST $3 \times [1024]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.01830</b>	0.01021	<b>0.02013</b>	0.00004	-9.1%	0.0509	0.1037	<b>1.20 s</b>	1.81 s	<b>50.4 s</b>	42X
		rand	<b>0.02216</b>	0.01236	<b>0.02428</b>	0.00007	-8.7%	0.0717	0.1484	<b>1.12 s</b>	1.11 s	<b>52.7 s</b>	47X
		least	<b>0.02432</b>	0.01384	<b>0.02665</b>	0.00009	-8.7%	0.0825	0.1777	<b>1.02 s</b>	924 ms	<b>54.3 s</b>	53X
	2	runner-up	<b>0.35867</b>	0.22120	<b>0.41040</b>	0.06626	-12.6%	0.8402	1.3513	<b>898 ms</b>	1.59 s	<b>438 s</b>	487X
		rand	<b>0.43892</b>	0.26980	<b>0.49715</b>	0.10233	-11.7%	1.2441	2.0387	<b>906 ms</b>	914 ms	<b>714 s</b>	788X
		least	<b>0.48361</b>	0.30147	<b>0.54689</b>	0.13256	-11.6%	1.4401	2.4916	<b>925 ms</b>	1.01 s	<b>858 s</b>	928X
	1	runner-up	<b>2.08887</b>	1.80150	<b>2.36642</b>	0.00734	-11.7%	4.8370	10.159	<b>836 ms</b>	3.16 s	<b>91.1 s</b>	109X
		rand	<b>2.59898</b>	2.25950	<b>2.91766</b>	0.01133	-10.9%	7.2177	17.796	<b>863 ms</b>	3.84 s	<b>109 s</b>	126X
		least	<b>2.87560</b>	2.50000	<b>3.22548</b>	0.01499	-10.8%	8.3523	22.395	<b>900 ms</b>	4.20 s	<b>122 s</b>	136X
MNIST $4 \times [1024]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.00715</b>	0.00219	-	0.00001	-	0.0485	0.08635	<b>1.90 s</b>	4.58 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.00823</b>	0.00264	-	0.00001	-	0.0793	0.1303	<b>2.25 s</b>	3.08 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.00899</b>	0.00304	-	0.00001	-	0.1028	0.1680	<b>2.15 s</b>	3.02 s	-	-
	2	runner-up	<b>0.16338</b>	0.05244	-	0.11015	-	0.8689	1.2422	<b>2.23 s</b>	3.50 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.18891</b>	0.06487	-	0.17734	-	1.4231	1.8921	<b>2.37 s</b>	2.72 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.20672</b>	0.07440	-	0.23710	-	1.8864	2.4451	<b>2.56 s</b>	2.77 s	-	-
	1	runner-up	<b>1.33794</b>	0.58480	-	0.00114	-	5.2685	10.079	<b>2.42 s</b>	2.71 s	-	-
		rand	<b>1.57649</b>	0.72800	-	0.00183	-	8.9764	17.200	<b>2.42 s</b>	2.91 s	-	-
		least	<b>1.73874</b>	0.82800	-	0.00244	-	11.867	23.910	<b>2.54 s</b>	3.54 s	-	-
CIFAR $5 \times [2048]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.00137</b>	0.00020	-	0.00000	-	0.0062	0.00950	<b>24.2 s</b>	60.4 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.00170</b>	0.00030	-	0.00000	-	0.0147	0.02351	<b>26.2 s</b>	78.1 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.00188</b>	0.00036	-	0.00000	-	0.0208	0.03416	<b>27.8 s</b>	79.0 s	-	-
	2	runner-up	<b>0.06122</b>	0.00951	-	0.00156	-	0.2712	0.3778	<b>34.0 s</b>	60.7 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.07654</b>	0.01417	-	0.00333	-	0.6399	0.9497	<b>36.8 s</b>	49.4 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.08456</b>	0.01778	-	0.00489	-	0.9169	1.4379	<b>37.4 s</b>	49.8 s	-	-
	1	runner-up	<b>0.93835</b>	0.22632	-	0.00000	-	4.0755	7.6529	<b>36.5 s</b>	70.6 s	-	-
		rand	<b>1.18928</b>	0.31984	-	0.00000	-	9.7145	21.643	<b>37.5 s</b>	53.6 s	-	-
		least	<b>1.31904</b>	0.38887	-	0.00001	-	12.793	34.497	<b>38.3 s</b>	48.6 s	-	-
CIFAR $6 \times [2048]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.00075</b>	0.00005	-	0.00000	-	0.0054	0.00770	<b>37.2 s</b>	106 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.00090</b>	0.00007	-	0.00000	-	0.0131	0.01866	<b>37.0 s</b>	119 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.00095</b>	0.00008	-	0.00000	-	0.0199	0.02868	<b>37.2 s</b>	126 s	-	-
	2	runner-up	<b>0.03463</b>	0.00228	-	0.00476	-	0.2394	0.2979	<b>56.1 s</b>	99.5 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.04129</b>	0.00331	-	0.01079	-	0.5860	0.7635	<b>60.2 s</b>	95.6 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.04387</b>	0.00385	-	0.01574	-	0.8756	1.2111	<b>61.8 s</b>	88.6 s	-	-
	1	runner-up	<b>0.59638</b>	0.05647	-	0.00000	-	3.3569	6.0112	<b>57.2 s</b>	108 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.72178</b>	0.08212	-	0.00000	-	8.2507	17.160	<b>61.4 s</b>	88.2 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.77179</b>	0.09397	-	0.00000	-	12.603	28.958	<b>62.1 s</b>	65.1 s	-	-
CIFAR $7 \times [1024]$	$\infty$	runner-up	<b>0.00119</b>	0.00006	-	0.00000	-	0.0062	0.0102	<b>10.5 s</b>	27.3 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.00134</b>	0.00008	-	0.00000	-	0.0112	0.0218	<b>10.6 s</b>	29.2 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.00141</b>	0.00010	-	0.00000	-	0.0148	0.0333	<b>11.2 s</b>	30.9 s	-	-
	2	runner-up	<b>0.05279</b>	0.00308	-	0.00020	-	0.2661	0.3943	<b>16.3 s</b>	28.2 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.05938</b>	0.00407	-	0.00029	-	0.5145	0.9730	<b>16.9 s</b>	27.3 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.06249</b>	0.00474	-	0.00038	-	0.6253	1.3709	<b>17.4 s</b>	27.6 s	-	-
	1	runner-up	<b>0.76647</b>	0.07028	-	0.00000	-	4.815	7.9987	<b>16.9 s</b>	27.8 s	-	-
		rand	<b>0.86467</b>	0.09239	-	0.00000	-	8.630	22.180	<b>17.6 s</b>	26.7 s	-	-
		least	<b>0.91127</b>	0.10639	-	0.00000	-	11.44	31.529	<b>17.5 s</b>	23.5 s	-	-
MNIST $3 \times [1024]$	$\infty$	untargeted	<b>0.01808</b>	0.01016	<b>0.01985</b>	0.00004	-8.9%	0.0458	0.0993	<b>915 ms</b>	2.17 s	<b>227 s</b>	248X
	2	untargeted	<b>0.35429</b>	0.21833	-	0.06541	-	0.7413	1.1118	<b>950 ms</b>	2.02 s	-	-
	1	untargeted	<b>2.05645</b>	1.78300	<b>2.32921</b>	0.00679	-11.7%	3.9661	9.0044	<b>829 ms</b>	4.41 s	<b>537 s</b>	648X
CIFAR $5 \times [2048]$	$\infty$	untargeted	<b>0.00136</b>	0.00020	-	0.00000	-	0.0056	0.00950	<b>24.1 s</b>	72.9 s	-	-
	2	untargeted	<b>0.06097</b>	0.00932	-	0.00053	-	0.2426	0.3702	<b>34.2 s</b>	77.0 s	-	-
	1	untargeted	<b>0.93429</b>	0.22535	-	0.00000	-	3.6704	7.3687	<b>35.6 s</b>	90.2 s	-	-

last few layers are likely to have uncertain activations, making **Fast-Lip** being too pessimistic. However, **Fast-Lip** outperforms the global Lipschitz constant based bound (**Op-norm**) which quickly goes down to 0 when the network goes deeper, as **Fast-Lip** is bounding the *local* Lipschitz constant to compute robustness lower bound.

In Table 2, we also apply our method to MNIST and CIFAR models to compare the minimum distortion for *untargeted* attacks. The computational benefit of **Fast-Lin** and **Fast-Lip** is more significant than **LP** because **LP** needs to solve  $n_m$  objectives (where  $n_m$  is the total number of classes), whereas the cost of our method stays mostly unchanged as we get the bounds for all network outputs simultaneously.

In Table 3, we compute our two proposed lower bounds on neural networks with defending techniques to evaluate the effects of defending techniques (e.g. how much robustness is increased). We train the network with two defending methods, defensive distillation (DD) [PMW<sup>+</sup>16] and adversarial training [MMS<sup>+</sup>18] based on robust optimization. For DD we use a temperature of 100, and for adversarial training, we train the network for 100 epochs with adversarial examples crafted by 10 iterations of PGD with  $\epsilon = 0.3$ . The test accuracy for the adversarially trained models dropped from 98.5% to 97.3%, and from 98.6% to 98.1%, for 3 and 4 layer MLP models, respectively. We observe that both defending techniques can increase the computed robustness lower bounds, however adversarial training is significantly more effective than defensive distillation. The lower bounds computed by **Fast-Lin** are close to the desired robustness guarantee  $\epsilon = 0.3$ .

Table 3: Comparison of the lower bounds for  $\ell_\infty$  distortion found by our proposed algorithms on models with defensive distillation (temperature = 100) and adversarial training ( $\epsilon = 0.3$ ) for three targeted attack classes.

Network	Method	runner-up			random			least-likely		
		Undefended	DD	Adv. Training	Undefended	DD	Adv. Training	Undefended	DD	Adv. Training
MNIST	Fast-Lin	0.01826	0.02724	<b>0.14730</b>	0.02211	0.03827	<b>0.17275</b>	0.02427	0.04967	<b>0.20136</b>
3*[1024]	Fast-Lip	0.00965	0.01803	0.09687	0.01217	0.02493	0.11618	0.01377	0.03207	0.13858
MNIST	Fast-Lin	0.00715	0.01561	<b>0.09579</b>	0.00822	0.02045	<b>0.11209</b>	0.00898	0.02368	<b>0.12901</b>
4*[1024]	Fast-Lip	0.00087	0.00585	0.04133	0.00145	0.00777	0.05048	0.00183	0.00903	0.06015

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper we have considered the problem of verifying the robustness property of ReLU networks (i.e. given a network and a data point, find a ball with maximum radius such that no adversarial example appears in this region). This is an NP hard problem, therefore previous approaches have turned it into either an integer programming or a linear programming problem in order to obtain a lower bound of minimum adversarial distortion. By exploiting the special properties of ReLU networks, we have here presented two computational efficient methods for this problem. Our algorithms are two orders of magnitude (or more) faster than LP-based methods, while obtaining solutions with similar quality; meanwhile, our bounds qualities are much better than the previously proposed operator-norm based methods. Additionally, our methods are efficient and easy to implement: we compute the bounds layer-by-layer, and the computation cost for each layer is similar to the cost of matrix products in forward propagation; moreover, we do not need to solve any integer programming, linear programming problems or their duals. Future work could extend our algorithm to handle the structure of convolutional layers and apply our algorithm to evaluate the robustness property of large DNNs such as ResNet on the ImageNet dataset.

**Acknowledgment.** The authors sincerely thank Aviad Rubinstein for the suggestion of using set-cover to prove hardness. The authors sincerely thank Dana Moshkovitz for pointing out some

references about the hardness result of set-cover. The authors would also like to thank Mika Göös, Rasmus Kyng, Jelani Nelson, Eric Price, Milan Rubinstein, Jacob Steinhardt, Zhengyu Wang, and David P. Woodruff for useful discussions.



## References

- [ABJK18] Nir Ailon, Anup Bhattacharya, Ragesh Jaiswal, and Amit Kumar. Approximate clustering with same-cluster queries. In *ITCS*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1704.01862>, 2018.
- [ALM<sup>+</sup>98] Sanjeev Arora, Carsten Lund, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Mario Szegedy. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(3):501–555, 1998.
- [AMS06] Noga Alon, Dana Moshkovitz, and Shmuel Safra. Algorithmic construction of sets for k-restrictions. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 2(2):153–177, 2006.
- [AMS11] Christoph Ambühl, Monaldo Mastrolilli, and Ola Svensson. Inapproximability results for maximum edge biclique, minimum linear arrangement, and sparsest cut. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(2):567–596, 2011.
- [AS98] Sanjeev Arora and Shmuel Safra. Probabilistic checking of proofs: A new characterization of np. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(1):70–122, 1998.
- [CADMRR18] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Arnaud De Mesmay, Eva Rotenberg, and Alan Roytman. The bane of low-dimensionality clustering. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 441–456. SIAM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1711.01171>, 2018.
- [CANK17] Moustapha M Cisse, Yossi Adi, Natalia Neverova, and Joseph Keshet. Houdini: Fooling deep structured visual and speech recognition models with adversarial examples. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6980–6990. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1707.05373>, 2017.
- [CNR17] Chih-Hong Cheng, Georg Nührenberg, and Harald Ruess. Maximum resilience of artificial neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.01040*, 2017.
- [CSZ<sup>+</sup>18] Pin-Yu Chen, Yash Sharma, Huan Zhang, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Ead: Elastic-net attacks to deep neural networks via adversarial examples. In *The Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1709.04114>, 2018.
- [CW17a] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Adversarial examples are not easily detected: Bypassing ten detection methods. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security, (AISec CCS)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.07263>, 2017.
- [CW17b] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Magnet and “efficient defenses against adversarial attacks” are not robust to adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.08478*, 2017.
- [CW17c] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 39–57, 2017.
- [CZC<sup>+</sup>18] Hongge Chen, Huan Zhang, Pin-Yu Chen, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Show-and-fool: Crafting adversarial examples for neural image captioning. In *The 56th*



- Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1712.02051>, 2018.
- [CZS<sup>+</sup>17] Pin-Yu Chen, Huan Zhang, Yash Sharma, Jinfeng Yi, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Zoo: Zeroth order optimization based black-box attacks to deep neural networks without training substitute models. In *AISeC '17 Proceedings of the 10th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1708.03999>, 2017.
- [Din16] Irit Dinur. Mildly exponential reduction from gap 3sat to polynomial-gap label-cover. In *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, volume 23:128, 2016.
- [DS14] Irit Dinur and David Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 624–633. ACM, 2014.
- [Ehl17] Ruediger Ehlers. Formal verification of piece-wise linear feed-forward neural networks. In *15th International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis (ATVA)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.01320>, 2017.
- [Fei02] Uriel Feige. Relations between average case complexity and approximation complexity. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 534–543. ACM, 2002.
- [FJ17] Matteo Fischetti and Jason Jo. Deep neural networks as 0-1 mixed integer linear programs: A feasibility study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06174*, 2017.
- [HA17] Matthias Hein and Maksym Andriushchenko. Formal guarantees on the robustness of a classifier against adversarial manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08475*, 2017.
- [Hås90] Johan Håstad. Tensor rank is np-complete. *Journal of Algorithms*, 11(4):644–654, 1990.
- [HWC<sup>+</sup>17] Warren He, James Wei, Xinyun Chen, Nicholas Carlini, and Dawn Song. Adversarial example defenses: Ensembles of weak defenses are not strong. In *The 11th USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies (WOOT)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1706.04701>, 2017.
- [IP01] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- [IPZ98] Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? In *Proceedings. 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 653–662. IEEE, 1998.
- [JL17] Robin Jia and Percy Liang. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), Outstanding paper award*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1707.07328>, 2017.
- [KBD<sup>+</sup>17] Guy Katz, Clark Barrett, David L Dill, Kyle Julian, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Reluplex: An efficient smt solver for verifying deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV)*, pages 97–117. Springer, 2017.

- [KGB17] Alexey Kurakin, Ian Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial machine learning at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1611.01236>, 2017.
- [KW17] J. Zico Kolter and Eric Wong. Provable defenses against adversarial examples via the convex outer adversarial polytope. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00851*, 2017.
- [LCLS17] Yanpei Liu, Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. Delving into transferable adversarial examples and black-box attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1611.02770>, 2017.
- [LCZH17] Xuanqing Liu, Minhao Cheng, Huan Zhang, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Towards robust neural networks via random self-ensemble. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00673*, 2017.
- [LM17] Alessio Lomuscio and Lalit Maganti. An approach to reachability analysis for feed-forward relu neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07351*, 2017.
- [LMS13] Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, and Saket Saurabh. Lower bounds based on the exponential time hypothesis. *Bulletin of EATCS*, 3(105), 2013.
- [MMS<sup>+</sup>18] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1706.06083>, 2018.
- [Mos12] Dana Moshkovitz. The projection games conjecture and the np-hardness of  $\ln n$ -approximating set-cover. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 276–287. Springer, 2012.
- [MR17] Pasin Manurangsi and Prasad Raghavendra. A birthday repetition theorem and complexity of approximating dense csps. In *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 78:1–78:15. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1607.02986>, 2017.
- [PMG<sup>+</sup>17] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Ian Goodfellow, Somesh Jha, Z Berkay Celik, and Ananthram Swami. Practical black-box attacks against machine learning. In *ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security (AsiaCCS)*, pages 506–519. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.02697>, 2017.
- [PMW<sup>+</sup>16] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Xi Wu, Somesh Jha, and Ananthram Swami. Distillation as a defense to adversarial perturbations against deep neural networks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 582–597, 2016.
- [RS97] Ran Raz and Shmuel Safra. A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and a sub-constant error-probability pcg characterization of np. In *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC)*, pages 475–484. ACM, 1997.
- [RSW16] Ilya Razenshteyn, Zhao Song, and David P Woodruff. Weighted low rank approximations with provable guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2016.

- [SND18] Aman Sinha, Hongseok Namkoong, and John Duchi. Certifiable distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1710.10571>, 2018.
- [SWZ17a] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Low rank approximation with entrywise  $\ell_1$ -norm error. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1611.00898>, 2017.
- [SWZ17b] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Relative error tensor low rank approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.08246*, 2017.
- [SWZ18] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Towards a zero-one law for entry-wise low rank approximation. 2018.
- [SZS<sup>+</sup>13] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- [TKP<sup>+</sup>18] Florian Tramèr, Alexey Kurakin, Nicolas Papernot, Dan Boneh, and Patrick McDaniel. Ensemble adversarial training: Attacks and defenses. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.07204>, 2018.
- [WGZ<sup>+</sup>17] Qinglong Wang, Wenbo Guo, Kaixuan Zhang, Alexander G Ororbia II, Xinyu Xing, Xue Liu, and C Lee Giles. Adversary resistant deep neural networks with an application to malware detection. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1145–1153. ACM, 2017.
- [WZC<sup>+</sup>18] Tsui-Wei Weng, Huan Zhang, Pin-Yu Chen, Yi Jinfeng, Dong Su, Yupeng Gao, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Luca Daniel. Evaluating the robustness of neural networks: An extreme value theory approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1801.10578>, 2018.
- [XWZ<sup>+</sup>17] Cihang Xie, Jianyu Wang, Zhishuai Zhang, Yuyin Zhou, Lingxi Xie, and Alan Yuille. Adversarial examples for semantic segmentation and object detection. In *ICCV*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1703.08603>, 2017.
- [Zak01] Radosław R Zakrzewski. Verification of a trained neural network accuracy. In *Neural Networks, 2001. Proceedings. IJCNN'01. International Joint Conference on*, volume 3, pages 1657–1662. IEEE, 2001.

## A Hardness

We introduce some basic definitions in Section A.1. We provide some backgrounds about inapproximability reduction in Section A.2. Section A.3 gives a warmup proof for boolean case. Section A.4 provides the proof of our main hardness result (for network with real inputs).

### A.1 Definitions

We provide some basic definitions in this section. First, we define the classic 3SAT problem:

**Definition A.1** (3SAT problem). *Given  $n$  variables and  $m$  clauses in a conjunctive normal form CNF formula with the size of each clause at most 3, the goal is to decide whether there exists an assignment to the  $n$  Boolean variables to make the CNF formula to be satisfied.*

We define Exponential Time Hypothesis which is a common concept in complexity field.

**Hypothesis A.2** (Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) [IPZ98]). *There is a  $\delta > 0$  such that the 3SAT problem defined in Definition A.1 cannot be solved in  $O(2^{\delta n})$  time.*

ETH had been used in many different problems, e.g. clustering [ABJK18, CADMRR18], low-rank approximation [RSW16, SWZ17a, SWZ17b, SWZ18]. For more details, we refer the readers to a survey [LMS13].

SET-COVER problem is a classical question in complexity theory. The exact SET-COVER problem is one of Karp's 21 NP-complete problems known to be NP-complete in 1972:

**Definition A.3** (SET-COVER). *The inputs are  $U, S$ ;  $U = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is a universe,  $P(U)$  is the power set of  $U$ , and  $S = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \subseteq P(U)$  is a family of subsets,  $\cup_{j \in [m]} S_j = U$ . The goal is to give a YES/NO answer to the follow decision problem:*

*Does there exist a set-cover of size  $t$ , i.e.,  $\exists C \subseteq [m]$ , such that  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = U$  with  $|C| = t$ ?*

Alternatively, we can also state the problem as finding the minimum set cover size  $t_0$ , via a binary search on  $t$  using the answers of the decision problem in A.3.

Then, we state the approximate SET-COVER problem,

**Definition A.4** (Approximate SET-COVER). *The inputs are  $U, S$ ;  $U = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is a universe,  $P(U)$  is the power set of  $U$ , and  $S = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \subseteq P(U)$  is a family of subsets,  $\cup_{j \in [m]} S_j = U$ . The goal is to distinguish between the following two cases:*

(I): There exists a small set-cover, i.e.,  $\exists C \subseteq [m]$ , such that  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = U$  with  $|C| \leq t$ .

(II): Every set-cover is large, i.e., every  $C \subseteq [m]$  with  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = U$  satisfies that  $|C| > \alpha t$ , where  $\alpha > 1$ .

An oracle that solves the Approximate SET-COVER problem can output an answer  $t_U \geq t_0$  but  $t_U \leq \alpha t_0$  using a binary search;  $t_U$  is an upper bound of  $t_0$  with a guaranteed approximation ratio  $\alpha$ . For example, we can use a greedy (rather than exact) algorithm to solve the SET-COVER problem, which cannot always find the smallest size of set cover  $t_0$ , but the size  $t_U$  given by the greedy algorithm is at most  $\alpha$  times as large as  $t_0$ .

In our setting, we investigate the hardness of finding the lower bound with a guaranteed approximation ration, but an approximate algorithm for SET-COVER gives us an upper bound of  $t_0$  instead of an lower bound of  $t_0$ . However, in the following proposition, we show that finding an lower bound with an approximation ratio of  $\alpha$  is equally hard as finding an upper bound with an approximation ratio of  $\alpha$ .

**Proposition A.5.** *Finding a lower bound  $t_L$  for the size of the minimal set-cover (that has size  $t_0$ ) with an approximation ratio  $\alpha$  is as hard as finding an upper bound  $t_U$  with an approximation ratio  $\alpha$ .*

*Proof.* If we find a lower bound  $t_L$  with  $\frac{t_0}{\alpha} \leq t_L \leq t_0$ , by multiplying both sides by  $\alpha$ , we also find an upper bound  $t_U = \alpha t_L$  which satisfies that  $t_0 \leq t_U \leq \alpha t_0$ . So finding a lower bound with an approximation ratio  $\alpha$  is at least as hard as finding an upper bound with an approximation ratio  $\alpha$ . The converse is also true.  $\square$

**Theorem A.6** ([RS97, AMS06, DS14]). *Unless  $\text{NP} = \text{P}$ , there is no polynomial time algorithm that gives a  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation to SET-COVER problem with universe size  $n$ .*

Then, we define our neural network robustness verification problem.

**Definition A.7** (ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{R}$ )). *Given a  $n$  hidden nodes ReLU neural network  $F(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where weights are all fixed, for a query input vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $F(x) \leq 0$ . The goal is to give a YES/NO answer to the following decision problem:*

*Does there exist a  $y$  with  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  such that  $F(y) > 0$ ?*

With an oracle of the decision problem available, we can figure out the smallest  $r$  (defined as  $r_0$ ) such that there exists a vector  $y$  with  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  and  $F(y) > 0$  via a binary search.

We also define a binary variant of the ROBUST-NET problem, denoted as ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{B}$ ). The proof for this variant is more straightforward than the real case, and will help the reader understand the proof for the real case.

**Definition A.8** (ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{B}$ )). *Given a  $n$  hidden nodes ReLU neural network  $F(x) : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  where weights are all fixed, for a query input vector  $x \in \{0, 1\}^d$  with  $F(x) = 0$ . The goal is to give a YES/NO answer to the following decision problem:*

*Does there exist a  $y$  with  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  such that  $F(y) = 1$ ?*

Then, we define the approximate version of our neural network robustness verification problems.

**Definition A.9** (Approximate ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{B}$ )). *Given a  $n$  hidden nodes ReLU neural network  $F(x) : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  where weights are all fixed, for a query input vector  $x \in \{0, 1\}^d$  with  $F(x) = 0$ . The goal is to distinguish the following two cases :*

(I): There exists a point  $y$  such that  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  and  $F(y) = 1$ .

(II): For all  $y$  satisfies  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq \alpha r$ , the  $F(y) = 0$ , where  $\alpha > 1$ .

**Definition A.10** (Approximate ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{R}$ )). *Given a  $n$  hidden nodes ReLU neural network  $F(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where weights are all fixed, for a query input vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $F(x) \leq 0$ . The goal is to distinguish the following two cases :*

(I): There exists a point  $y$  such that  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  and  $F(y) > 0$ .

(II): For all  $y$  satisfies  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq \alpha r$ , the  $F(y) \leq 0$ , where  $\alpha > 1$ .

As an analogy to SET-COVER, an oracle that solves the Approximate ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{R}$ ) problem can output an answer  $r \geq r_0$  but  $r \leq \alpha r_0$ , which is an upper bound of  $r_0$  with a guaranteed approximation ratio  $\alpha$ . With a similar statement as in Proposition A.5, if we divide the answer  $r$  by  $\alpha$ , then we get a lower bound  $r' = \frac{r}{\alpha}$  where  $r' \geq \frac{r_0}{\alpha}$ , which is a lower bound with a guaranteed approximation ratio. If we can solve Approximate ROBUST-NET( $\mathbb{R}$ ), we can get a lower bound with a guaranteed approximation ratio, which is the desired goal of our paper.

## A.2 Background of the PCP theorem

The famous Probabilistically Checkable Proofs (PCP) theorem is the cornerstone of the theory of computational hardness of approximation, which investigates the inherent difficulty in designing efficient approximation algorithms for various optimization problems.<sup>5</sup> The formal definition can be stated as follows,

**Theorem A.11** ([AS98, ALM<sup>+</sup>98]). *Given a SAT formula  $\phi$  of size  $n$  we can in time polynomial in  $n$  construct a set of  $M$  tests satisfying the following:*

- (I) : Each test queries a constant number  $d$  of bits from a proof, and based on the outcome of the queries it either accepts or rejects  $\phi$ .
- (II) : (Yes Case / Completeness) If  $\phi$  is satisfiable, then there exists a proof so that all tests accept  $\phi$ .
- (III) : (No Case / Soundness) If  $\phi$  is not satisfiable, then no proof will cause more than  $M/2$  tests to accept  $\phi$ .

Note that PCP kind of reduction is slightly different from NP reduction, for more examples (e.g. maximum edge biclique, sparsest cut) about how to use PCP theorem to prove inapproximability results, we refer the readers to [AMS11].

## A.3 Warm-up

We state our hardness result (for boolean inputs case) in this Section. The reduction procedure for network with boolean inputs is more straightforward and easier to understand than the real inputs case.

**Theorem A.12.** *Unless  $\text{NP} = \text{P}$ , there is no polynomial time algorithm to give a  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation to  $\text{ROBUST-NET}(\mathbb{B})$  problem (Definition A.9) with  $n$  hidden nodes.*

*Proof.* Consider a set-cover instance, let  $S$  denote a set of sets  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d\}$  where  $s_j \subseteq [n], \forall j \in [d]$ .

For each set  $S_j$  we create an input node  $u_j$ . For each element  $i \in [n]$ , we create a hidden node  $v_i$ . For each  $i \in [n]$  and  $j \in [d]$ , if  $i \in S_j$ , then we connect  $u_j$  and  $v_i$ . We also create an output node  $w$ , for each  $i \in [n]$ , we connect node  $v_i$  and node  $w$ .

Let  $\mathbf{1}_{i \in S_j}$  denote the indicator function that it is 1 if  $i \in S_j$  and 0 otherwise. Let  $T_i$  denote the set that  $T_i = \{j \mid i \in S_j, \forall j \in [d]\}$ . For each  $i \in [n]$ , we define an activation function  $\phi_i$  satisfies that

$$\phi_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{j \in T_i} u_j \geq 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $u_j \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\phi_i$  can be implemented in this way using ReLU activations:

$$\phi_i = 1 - \max \left( 0, 1 - \sum_{j \in T_i} u_j \right).$$

Note that  $\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{1}_{i \in S_j} = \sum_{j=1}^d u_j$ , because  $u_j = 1$  indicates choosing set  $S_j$  and  $u_j = 0$  otherwise.

---

<sup>5</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PCP\\_theorem](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PCP_theorem)

For final output node  $w$ , we define an activation function  $\psi$  satisfies that

$$\psi = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \geq n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $v_i \in [n]$ ,  $\psi$  can be implemented as

$$\psi = \max \left( 0, \sum_{i=1}^n v_i - n + 1 \right).$$

We use vector  $x$  to denote  $\{0\}^d$  vector and it is to easy to see that  $F(x) = 0$ . Let  $\alpha > 1$  denote a fixed parameter. Also, we have  $F(y) > 0$  if and only if  $C = \{j | y_j = 1\}$  is a set-cover. According to our construction, we can have the following two claims,

**Claim A.13** (Completeness). *If there exists a set-cover  $C \subseteq [d]$  with  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = [n]$  and  $|C| \leq r$ , then there exists a point  $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$  such that  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  and  $F(y) > 0$ .*

**Claim A.14** (Soundness). *If for every  $C \subseteq [d]$  with  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = U$  satisfies that  $|C| > \alpha \cdot t$ , then for all  $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$  satisfies that  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq \alpha r$ ,  $F(y) \leq 0$  holds.*

Therefore, using Theorem A.11, Theorem A.6, Claim A.13 and Claim A.14 completes the proof.  $\square$

## A.4 Main result

We prove our main hardness result, for networks with real inputs, in this section.

**Theorem A.15.** *Unless  $\text{NP} = \text{P}$ , there is no polynomial time algorithm to give an  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation to  $\text{ROBUST-NET}(\mathbb{R})$  problem (Definition A.10) with  $n$  hidden nodes.*

*Proof.* Consider a set-cover instance, let  $S$  denote a set of sets  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d\}$  where  $S_j \subseteq [n], \forall j \in [d]$ .

For each set  $S_j$  we create an input node  $u_j$ . For each  $j \in [d]$ , we create a hidden node  $t_j$  and connect  $u_j$  and  $t_j$ .

For each element  $i \in [n]$ , we create a hidden node  $v_i$ . For each  $i \in [n]$  and  $j \in [d]$ , if  $i \in S_j$ , then we connect  $u_j$  and  $v_i$ . Finally, we create an output node  $w$  and for each  $i \in [n]$ , we connect node  $v_i$  and node  $w$ .

Let  $\delta = 1/d$ . For each  $j \in [n]$ , we create an activation function  $\phi_{1,j}$  on  $t_j$  such that

$$\phi_{1,j} = -\max(0, \delta - u_j) + \max(0, u_j - 1 + \delta)$$

It is easy to see that

$$t_j = \phi_{1,j} = \begin{cases} u_j - \delta & \text{if } u_j \in [0, \delta] \\ u_j - (1 - \delta) & \text{if } u_j \in [1 - \delta, 1] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $T_i$  denote the set that  $T_i = \{j \mid i \in S_j, \forall j \in [d]\}$ . For each  $i \in [n]$ , we want an activation function  $\phi_{2,i}$  on node  $v_i$  which satisfies that

$$\phi_{2,i} \in \begin{cases} [-\delta, 0], & \text{if } \forall j \in T_i, t_j \in [-\delta, 0], \\ [0, \delta], & \text{if } \exists j \in T_i, t_j \in [0, \delta]. \end{cases}$$



which can be implemented in the following way

$$\phi_{2,i} = \max_{j \in T_i} t_j.$$

For the final output node  $w$ , we define it as

$$w = \min_{i \in [n]} v_i.$$

We use vector  $x$  to denote  $\{0\}^d$  vector and it is to easy to see that  $F(x) = -\delta < 0$ . Let  $\alpha > 1$  denote a fixed parameter. According to our construction, we can have the following two Claims,

**Claim A.16** (Completeness). *If there exists a set-cover  $C \subseteq [d]$  with  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = [n]$  and  $|C| \leq r$ , then there exists a point  $y \in [0, 1]^d$  such that  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq r$  and  $F(y) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we let the set cover to be  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$ . Let  $y_1 = y_2 = \dots = y_r = 1$  and  $y_{r+1} = y_{r+2} = \dots = y_d = 0$ . By the definition of  $t_j$ , we have  $t_1 = t_2 = \dots = t_r = \delta$ . Since  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$  is a set-cover, we know that  $v_i = \delta$  for all  $i \in [n]$ . Then  $F(y) = w = \min_{i \in [n]} v_i = \delta > 0$ . Since we also have  $\|y\|_1 = r$ , the adversarial point is found.  $\square$

**Claim A.17** (Soundness). *If for every  $C \subseteq [d]$  with  $\cup_{j \in C} S_j = U$  satisfies that  $|C| > \alpha \cdot r$ , then for all  $y \in [0, 1]^d$  satisfies that  $\|x - y\|_1 \leq \alpha r(1 - 1/d)$ ,  $F(y) \leq 0$  holds.*

*Proof.* Proof by contradiction. We assume that there exists  $y$  such that  $F(y) > 0$  and  $\|y\|_1 \leq \alpha r(1 - 1/d)$ . Since  $F(y) > 0$ , we have for all  $i$ ,  $v_i > 0$ . Thus there exists  $j \in T_i$  such that  $t_j > 0$ . Let  $\pi : [n] \rightarrow Q$  denote a mapping ( $Q \subseteq [d]$  will be decided later). This means that for each  $i \in [n]$ , there exists  $j \in T_i$ , such that  $1 - \delta < y_j \leq 1$ , and we let  $\pi(i)$  denote that  $j$ .

We define set  $Q \subseteq [d]$  as follows

$$Q = \{j \mid \exists i \in [n], \text{ s.t. } \pi(i) = j \in T_i \text{ and } t_j > 0\}.$$

Since  $\sum_{j \in [d]} |y_j| = \|y\|_1 \leq \alpha r(1 - 1/d)$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in Q} |y_j| \leq \sum_{j \in [d]} |y_j| \leq \alpha r(1 - 1/d),$$

where the first step follows by  $|Q| \leq d$ .

Because for all  $j \in Q$ ,  $|y_j| > 1 - \delta = 1 - 1/d$ , we have

$$|Q| \leq \frac{\alpha r(1 - 1/d)}{(1 - 1/d)} = \alpha \cdot r.$$

So  $\{S_j\}_{j \in Q}$  is a set-cover with size less than or equal to  $\alpha \cdot r$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Therefore, using Theorem A.11, Theorem A.6, Claim A.16 and Claim A.17 completes the proof.  $\square$

By making stronger assumptions of ETH and Projection Games Conjecture (PGC), we can have the following stronger result which excludes all  $2^{o(n^c)}$  time algorithms, where  $c > 0$  is some fixed constant:

**Corollary A.18.** *Assuming Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH, see Hypothesis A.2) and Projection Games Conjecture (PGC, see [Mos12]), there is no  $2^{o(n^c)}$  time algorithm that gives a  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$ -approximation to ROBUST-NET problem with  $n$  hidden nodes, where  $c > 0$  is some fixed constant.*

*Proof.* It follows by the construction in Theorem A.15 and [Mos12].  $\square$

## B Proof of Theorem 3.5

For a  $m$ -layer ReLU network, assume we know all the pre-ReLU activation bounds  $\mathbf{l}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{(k)}$ ,  $\forall k \in [m-1]$  for a  $m$ -layer ReLU network and we want to compute the bounds of the  $j$  th output at  $m$  th layer.

The  $j$  th output can be written as

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} [\phi_{m-1}(\mathbf{x})]_k + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)}, \quad (18)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)}, \quad (19)$$

$$= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^+, \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^-, \mathcal{I}_{m-1}} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)}. \quad (20)$$

For neurons belonging to category (i), i.e.,  $k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^+$ ,

$$\sigma(\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) = \mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}.$$

For neurons belonging to category (ii), i.e.,  $k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^-$ ,

$$\sigma(\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) = 0.$$

Finally, for neurons belonging to Category (iii), i.e.,  $k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}$ , we bound their outputs. If we adopt the linear upper and lower bounds in (3) and let  $\mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} := \frac{\mathbf{u}_k^{(m-1)}}{\mathbf{u}_k^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)}}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} (\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) \leq \sigma(\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) \leq \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} (\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)}). \quad (21)$$

### B.1 Upper bound

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma B.1.

**Lemma B.1** (Upper bound with explicit function). *Given an  $m$ -layer ReLU neural network function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$ , parameters  $p, \epsilon$ , there exists two explicit functions  $f^L : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  and  $f^U : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  (see Definition 3.4) such that  $\forall j \in [n_m]$ ,*

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^U(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon).$$

Notice that (21) can be used to construct an upper bound and lower bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$  by considering the signs of the weights  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)}$ . Let  $f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  be an upper bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$ ;  $f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  can be constructed by taking the right-hand-side (RHS) of (21) if  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} > 0$  and taking the left-hand-side

(LHS) of (21) if  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} < 0$ :

$$f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^+} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} (\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}, \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} (\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)}) \\ & + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}, \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} < 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} (\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} (\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)}) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}, \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} \mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) \\ & + \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} \mathbf{b}_k^{(m-1)} - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}, \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} > 0} \mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we set  $\mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} = 1$  for  $k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^+$  and set  $\mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} = 0$  for  $k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}^-$  from (22) to (23) and collect the constant terms (independent of  $\mathbf{x}$ ) in the parenthesis from (23) to (24).

If we let  $\mathbf{A}^{(m-1)} = \mathbf{W}^{(m)} \mathbf{D}^{(m-1)}$ , where  $\mathbf{D}^{(m-1)}$  is a diagonal matrix with diagonals being  $\mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)}$ , then we can rewrite  $f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  into the following:

$$f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)} \phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \left( \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{b}^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} \right) \quad (25)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} \left( \sum_{r=1}^{n_{m-2}} \mathbf{W}_{k,r}^{(m-1)} [\phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x})]_r \right) + \left( \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{b}^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} \right) \quad (26)$$

$$= \sum_{r=1}^{n_{m-2}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{W}_{k,r}^{(m-1)} [\phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x})]_r + \left( \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{b}^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} \right) \quad (27)$$

$$= \sum_{r=1}^{n_{m-2}} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{j,r}^{(m-1)} [\phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x})]_r + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_j^{(m-1)}. \quad (28)$$

From (24) to (25), we rewrite the summation terms in the parenthesis into matrix-vector multiplications and for each  $j \in [n_m]$  let

$$\mathbf{T}_{k,j}^{(m-1)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)} & \text{if } k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}, \mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

since  $0 \leq \mathbf{d}_k^{(m-1)} \leq 1$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} > 0$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} > 0$ .

From (25) to (26), we simply write out the inner product  $\mathbf{W}_{k,:}^{(m-1)}\phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x})$  into a summation form, and from (26) to (27), we exchange the summation order of  $k$  and  $r$ . From (27) to (28), we let

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{j,r}^{(m-1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{m-1}} \mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{W}_{k,r}^{(m-1)} \quad (29)$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_j^{(m-1)} = \left( \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{b}^{(m-1)} - \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(m-1)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(m-1)} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} \right) \quad (30)$$

and now we have (28) in the same form as (18).

Indeed, in (18), the running index is  $k$  and we are looking at the  $m$  th layer, with weights  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)}$ , activation functions  $\phi_{m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  and bias term  $\mathbf{b}_j^{(m)}$ ; in (28), the running index is  $r$  and we are looking at the  $m-1$  th layer with *equivalent* weights  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{j,r}^{(m-1)}$ , activation functions  $\phi_{m-2}(\mathbf{x})$  and *equivalent* bias  $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_j^{(m-1)}$ . Thus, we can use the same technique from (18) to (28) and obtain an upper bound on the  $f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  and repeat this procedure until obtaining  $f_j^{U,1}(\mathbf{x})$ , where

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^{U,m-1}(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^{U,m-2}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \dots \leq f_j^{U,1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Let the final upper bound  $f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) = f_j^{U,1}(\mathbf{x})$ , and now we have

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^U(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) = [f^U(\mathbf{x})]_j$ ,

$$f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)})$$

and for  $k = 1, \dots, m-1$ ,

$$\mathbf{A}^{(m-1)} = \mathbf{W}^{(m)} \mathbf{D}^{(m-1)}, \mathbf{A}^{(k-1)} = \mathbf{A}^{(k)} \mathbf{W}^{(k)} \mathbf{D}^{(k-1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}^{(0)} &= \mathbf{I}_{n_0} \\ \mathbf{D}_{r,r}^{(k)} &= \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{u}_r^{(k)}}{\mathbf{u}_r^{(k)} - \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)}} & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k \\ 1 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \\ 0 & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k^- \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{T}_{r,j}^{(k)} &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k, \mathbf{A}_{j,r}^{(k)} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

## B.2 Lower bound

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma B.2.

**Lemma B.2** (Lower bound with explicit function). *Given an  $m$ -layer ReLU neural network function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$ , parameters  $p, \epsilon$ , there exists two explicit functions  $f^L : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  and  $f^U : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_m}$  (see Definition 3.4) such that  $\forall j \in [n_m]$ ,*

$$f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon).$$

Similar to deriving the upper bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$ , we consider the signs of the weights  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)}$  to derive the lower bound. Let  $f_j^{L,m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  be a lower bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$ ;  $f_j^{L,m-1}(\mathbf{x})$  can be constructed by taking the right-hand-side (RHS) of (21) if  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} < 0$  and taking the left-hand-side (LHS) of (21) if  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} > 0$ . Following the procedure in (22) to (28) (except that now the additional bias term is from the set  $k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_{j,k}^{(m)} < 0$ ), the lower bound is similar to the upper bound we have derived but but replace  $\mathbf{T}^{(m-1)}$  by  $\mathbf{H}^{(m-1)}$ , where for each  $j \in [n_m]$ ,

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,j}^{(m-1)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{l}_k^{(m-1)} & \text{if } k \in \mathcal{I}_{m-1}, \mathbf{A}_{j,k}^{(m-1)} < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is because the linear upper and lower bounds in (3) has the same slope  $\frac{u}{u-l}$  on both sides (i.e.  $\sigma(y)$  is bounded by two lines with the same slope but different intercept), which gives the same  $\mathbf{A}$  matrix and  $\mathbf{D}$  matrix in computing the upper bound and lower bound of  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$ . This is the key to facilitate a faster computation under this linear approximation (3). Thus, the lower bound for  $f_j(\mathbf{x})$  is:

$$f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) = [f^L(\mathbf{x})]_j$ ,

$$f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)})$$

and for  $k = 1, \dots, m-1$ ,

$$\mathbf{H}_{r,j}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{l}_r^{(k)} & \text{if } r \in \mathcal{I}_k, \mathbf{A}_{j,r}^{(k)} < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

## C Proof of Corollary 3.7

By Theorem 3.5, for  $\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)$ , we have  $f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^U(\mathbf{x})$ . Thus,

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) \leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} f_j^U(\mathbf{x}), \quad (31)$$

$$f_j(\mathbf{x}) \geq f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) \geq \min_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} f_j^L(\mathbf{x}). \quad (32)$$

Since  $f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j^U &:= \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} f_j^U(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \left( \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \right) \\ &= \left( \max_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} \right) + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$= \epsilon \left( \max_{\mathbf{y} \in B_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{y} \right) + \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \quad (34)$$

$$= \epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q + \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)}). \quad (35)$$

From (33) to (34), we do a transformation of variable  $\mathbf{y} := \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0}{\epsilon}$  and therefore  $\mathbf{y} \in B_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)$ . By the definition of dual norm  $\|\cdot\|_*$ :

$$\|\mathbf{z}\|_* = \{\sup_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{y} \mid \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq 1\},$$

and the fact that  $\ell_q$  norm is dual of  $\ell_p$  norm for  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ , the term  $\left(\max_{\mathbf{y} \in B_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{y}\right)$  in (34) can be expressed as  $\|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q$  in (35). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j^L &:= \min_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} f_j^L(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \left( \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \right) \\ &= \left( \min_{\mathbf{x} \in B_p(\mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon)} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x} \right) + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \\ &= \epsilon \left( \min_{\mathbf{y} \in B_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{y} \right) + \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \\ &= -\epsilon \left( \max_{\mathbf{y} \in B_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)} -\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{y} \right) + \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}) \quad (36) \\ &= -\epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q + \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} (\mathbf{b}^{(k)} - \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)}). \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

Again, from (36) to (37), we simply replace  $\left(\max_{\mathbf{y} \in B_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)} -\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{y}\right)$  by  $\|-\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q = \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q$ . Thus, if we use  $\nu_j$  to denote the common term  $\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{b}_j^{(m)} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{b}^{(k)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j^U &= \epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{T}_{:,j}^{(k)} + \nu_j, \quad (\text{upper bound}) \\ \gamma_j^L &= -\epsilon \|\mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(0)}\|_q - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{A}_{j,:}^{(k)} \mathbf{H}_{:,j}^{(k)} + \nu_j. \quad (\text{lower bound}) \end{aligned}$$

## D An alternative bound on the Lipschitz constant

Using the property of norm, we can derive an upper bound of the gradient norm of a 2-layer ReLU network in the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla f_j(\mathbf{x})\|_q \\ &= \|\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|_q \\ &= \|\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(1)} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(1)}) \mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|_q \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(1)} \mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|_q + \|\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(1)} \mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|_q \quad (39)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(1)} \mathbf{W}^{(1)}\|_q + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1} \|\mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)}\|_q \quad (40)$$

where with a slight abuse of notation, we use  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(1)}$  to denote the diagonal activation matrix for neurons who are always activated, i.e. its  $(r, r)$  entry  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{a(r,r)}^{(1)}$  is 1 if  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1^+$  and 0 otherwise, and we

use  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(1)}$  to denote the diagonal activation matrix for neurons whose status are uncertain because they could possibly be active or inactive, i.e. its  $(r, r)$  entry  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{u(r,r)}^{(1)}$  is 1 if  $r \in \mathcal{I}_1$  and 0 otherwise. Therefore, we can write  $\mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)}$  as a sum of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_a^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(1)}$ .

Note that (38) to (39) is from the sub-additive property of a norm, and (39) to (40) uses the sub-additive property of a norm again and set the uncertain neurons encoding all to 1 because

$$\|\mathbf{W}_{j,:}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_u^{(1)} \mathbf{W}^{(1)}\| = \left\| \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1} \mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{u(r,r)}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)} \right\| \leq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1} \|\mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{u(r,r)}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)}\| \leq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{I}_1} \|\mathbf{W}_{j,r}^{(2)} \mathbf{W}_{r,:}^{(1)}\|.$$

Notice that (40) can be used as an upper bound of Lipschitz constant and is applicable to compute a certified lower bound for minimum adversarial distortion of a general  $\ell_p$  norm attack. However, this bound is expected to be less tight because we simply include all the uncertain neurons to get an upper bound on the norm in (40).