

COVER: A Heuristic Greedy Adversarial Attack on Prompt-based Learning in Language Models*

Zihao Tan¹, Qingliang Chen¹ ✉, Wenbin Zhu¹, and Yongjian Huang²

¹Department of Computer Science, Jinan University, Guangzhou 510632, China

²Guangzhou Xuanyuan Research Institute Co., Ltd., Guangzhou 510006, China
tzhtyson@stu2022.jnu.edu.cn, tpchen@jnu.edu.cn

Abstract. Prompt-based learning has been proved to be an effective way in pre-trained language models (PLMs), especially in low-resource scenarios like few-shot settings. However, the trustworthiness of PLMs is of paramount significance and potential vulnerabilities have been shown in prompt-based templates that could mislead the predictions of language models, causing serious security concerns. In this paper, we will shed light on some vulnerabilities of PLMs, by proposing a prompt-based adversarial attack on manual templates in black box scenarios. First of all, we design character-level and word-level heuristic approaches to break manual templates separately. Then we present a greedy algorithm for the attack based on the above heuristic destructive approaches. Finally, we evaluate our approach with the classification tasks on three variants of BERT series models and eight datasets. And comprehensive experimental results justify the effectiveness of our approach in terms of attack success rate and attack speed.

Keywords: Prompt-based Learning · Heuristic Greedy Attack · Few-shot Classification Tasks.

1 Introduction

The introduction of pre-trained language models (PLMs) has greatly revolutionized natural language processing with pre-training+fine-tuning paradigm. However, such a paradigm suffers from some drawbacks of high computational resources and poor inference due to too little or unbalanced data during fine-tuning [1]. To tackle this problem, prompt-based learning has been proposed in recent years [2], which can stimulate the potential of language models with less data and computational resources by designing templates and verbalizers.

As for the template designs, however, malicious design like adversarial attacks will mislead the model predictions. In general, adversarial attacks on PLMs are

* Supported by Guangdong Provincial Key-Area Research and Development Program (2022B0101010005), Qinghai Provincial Science and Technology Research Program (2021-QY-206), National Natural Science Foundation of China (62071201), and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (No.2022A1515010119). The corresponding author is Qingliang Chen.

divided into white-box [3,4] and black-box [5] ones. The former requires obtaining information about the parameters, gradients, and structure of the model. In the latter case, only the output distribution of the model is needed. Nonetheless, existing research on adversarial attacks on prompt-based learning mainly focuses on white-box scenarios, while there is little study on black-box ones, which can generate more serious security concerns in practices.

To address the deficit, we propose a **Character-level and wOrd-leVel hEuristic gReedy (COVER)** approach in this paper. First, we design character-level and word-level heuristic destruction rules against the manual template, which act to corrupt the template before each model’s prediction. Then, we introduce a greedy strategy in the attack phase. We conducted extensive experiments with three BERT series models on eight classification tasks, and the experimental results have justified the destructive power and attack speed of our proposed method. In summary, the contributions of the paper are as follows:

- We present the manual template black-box attack method in prompt-based learning, which is an attack scenario with significant practical implications, and almost no other works focus on it.
- We design character-level and word-level heuristic manual template destruction rules that can work before each prediction, and furthermore with a greedy approach based on the above rules.
- Experiments show that our attack method achieves high attack success rates and low number of queries on most of the classification task datasets.

2 The Proposed Method

Consider a publicly released PLM $f : X \rightarrow Y$ after few-shot tuning of a text classification task. An input text $x \in X$ is transformed by a clean template T_c like $x'_c = T_c(x)$. Then it can be passed into the f to make a correct prediction:

$$\arg \max_{y_i \in Y} P(y_i | x'_c) = y_{true}. \quad (1)$$

where y_{true} is the correct label. Attackers try to use a series of destruction rules to attack the clean template, fooling the PLM with the processed poisoned template $x'_p = T_p(x)$. And the classifier will finally predict wrongly:

$$\arg \max_{y_i \in Y} P(y_i | x'_p) \neq y_{true}. \quad (2)$$

In our setting, it is worth noting that our attack scenario is totally based on the black-box ones, without the need of the gradient, score, structure and parameter information of the PLM to carry out the attack. The overview of prompt-based learning adversarial attack in black-box scenarios is shown in Figure 1.

Inspired by Chen et al. [6] for real-world attackers’ sabotage rules on texts, we devise a series of character-level and word-level heuristic destruction rules of prompt-based learning. The difference is that they simply use six of the destruction rules (rule 1-5, 10) and did not normalize destruction level. Table 1 gives a summary of the whole destruction rules.




Fig. 1: Overview of the adversarial attack in black-box scenarios

Table 1: Destruction rules on template based on character-level and word-level

Level	Rule	Description	Example
Char	(1)	Insert a space into words	<i>x.</i> The sen timent is <mask>
	(2)	Insert a punctuation into words	<i>x.</i> The sent*iment is <mask>
	(3)	Swap two adjacent character	<i>x.</i> The senitment is <mask>
	(4)	Delete a character of words	<i>x.</i> The seniment is <mask>
	(5)	Replace a character of words	<i>x.</i> The 5entiment is <mask>
	(6)	Duplicate a character of words	<i>x.</i> The sentiment is <mask>
Word	(7)	Exchange mask token’s position	<i>x.</i> The <mask> sentiment is
	(8)	Swap two word except mask token	<i>x.</i> The is sentiment <mask>
	(9)	Add negative word after linking verb	<i>x.</i> The sentiment is little <mask>
	(10)	Add prefixes and suffixes	<i>x.</i> sad The sentiment is <mask> sad

Now, we introduce a greedy attack strategy based on the heuristic destruction rules described above. Specifically, we use an ordered dictionary $Dict$ in the data structure, which includes the $value$ to record the time of successful attacks and the corresponding template is recorded by its key . The dictionary is arranged in descending order by values. For future data, the first k templates with the top dictionary sorting are taken out as the candidate template set $C_{template}$:

$$C_{template} = \underset{d_i \in Dict}{topk} (d_i.value) \quad (3)$$

The complete algorithm pipeline is shown in Algorithm 1.

3 Experiments

Dataset and Victim Model The datasets we chose to evaluate our method have four domains as shown in Table 2. The sentiment domain includes SST2 [10] and IMDB [11], and the remaining disinformation, toxic and spam domains consist of six datasets which are compiled by Chen et al. [6]. And we use three pre-trained language models of the BERT family: BERT-base (109M) [7], RoBERTa-base (125M) and RoBERTa-large (355M) [8].

Algorithm 1: Adversarial Attack by COVER

Input: Text $x \in X$ with correct prediction $y_{true} \in Y$, clean template T_c , ordered dictionary $Dict$, destruction function g_i , PLM f , iteration $ITER$, repeat time REP , and max length LEN .

Output: Attack success (true) or fail (false)

```

1   $iter \leftarrow 0$ ;
2  if  $len(Dict) > 0$  then
3     $C_{template} = Dict.get\_top\_k()$ ;
4    for  $t_p$  in  $C_{template}$  do
5      if  $f(t_p(x)) \neq y_{true}$  then
6         $Dict.record(t_p)$ ;
7         $iter \leftarrow iter + 1$ ;
8        return true;
9      end
10   end
11 end
12  $T_p \leftarrow g_9(g_{10}(T_c))$ ;
13  $iter \leftarrow iter + 1$ ;
14 if  $f(T_p(x)) \neq y_{true}$  then
15    $Dict.add(T_p)$ ;
16   return true;
17 end
18 while  $iter < ITER \cdot REP$  and  $len(T_c(x)) < LEN$  do
19    $i \leftarrow Random(rules), rules \in [1, 9]$ ;
20    $T_p = g_i(T_p)$ ;
21   if  $f(T_p(x)) \neq y_{true}$  then
22      $Dict.record(T_p)$ ;
23      $iter \leftarrow iter + 1$ ;
24     return true;
25   end
26 end
27 return false;

```

Parameter Settings For each dataset in the pre-trained model, 8 shots of few-shot tuning were performed. We designed two sets of manual templates for each dataset separately, each containing two and swapped sentences of the original input. On the training phase, we tune 10 epochs by AdamW optimizer [9] with learning rate of $1e - 5$ and weight decay $1e - 2$. On the attack phase, we iterate 30 times for each sentence and the k value of the ordered dictionary is set to 2.

Metrics and Baselines We apply two evaluation metrics: (1) Attack success rate (ASR): the percentage of data which has been attacked successfully. (2) Attack efficiency (Query): the query times to the PLM after crafting a victim input.

Table 2: Dataset details

Region	Dataset	Class	Description
Sentiment	SST2	2	Movie reviews and human comments data
	IMDB	2	Large movie review dataset
Disinformation	Amazon-LB	2	Small subsets of Amazon Luxury Beauty Review
	CGFake	2	Computer-generated Fake Review Dataset
Toxic	HSOL	2	Hate offensive speech dataset
	Jigsaw2018	2	Toxic Comment Classification Challenge in Kaggle
Spam	Enron	2	Collections of emails include legitimate and spam
	SpamAssassin	2	Collections of emails include ham and spam

Since there is no prior work for black-box adversarial attacks on prompt-based learning, we think about two baselines. The first is the heuristic attack method ROCKET proposed by Chen [6] et al. for text to templates, we keep the stop words with minor modifications and name it **rocket-prompt**. And the other baseline is character-level and word-level heuristic approaches without greedy strategy and is labelled **COVER**.

Table 3: COVER versus rocket-prompt and COVE in ASR and Query.

Task		Sentiment		Disinformation		Toxic		Spam	
PLM	Method Dataset	SST2		Amazon-LB		HSOL		Enron	
		ASR(%)	Query	ASR(%)	Query	ASR(%)	Query	ASR(%)	Query
BERT-base	rocket-prompt	94.8	3127.5	100	1537.8	14.4	13118.5	58.3	6985.3
	COVE	99.8	962	100	1006.3	57.2	6638.8	85.8	2668
	COVER	100	494	100	773	89.9	2058	96.7	1008.3
RoBERTa-base	rocket-prompt	92.3	4180.5	81.5	5535.8	22.6	12036.3	94.3	2414.5
	COVE	97.5	1698.8	90.2	3222.8	35.3	6638.8	97.2	1402
	COVER	99.9	757.5	98	1527	87.5	2293.3	99.4	998
RoBERTa-large	rocket-prompt	92.3	4021.5	93	4417.75	3.7	14560	80.4	4962.8
	COVE	97.3	1663.5	93.5	4136.25	13.2	12456.8	90.9	2621.5
	COVER	99.8	733.25	95.8	3150	27.7	10624	93.8	1933
Average Accuracy (%)		83		71.8		70.5		76.6	

PLM	Method Dataset	IMDB		CGFake		Jigsaw2018		SpamAssassin	
		ASR(%)	Query	ASR(%)	Query	ASR(%)	Query	ASR(%)	Query
BERT-base	rocket-prompt	24.1	12624.5	99.9	1537.8	20.1	12392	74.5	4699
	COVE	72.8	5834.8	100	1097.5	46.2	7989	92.3	1862.3
	COVER	94.9	1703	100	674.3	86.4	2473.5	99.8	536.75
RoBERTa-base	rocket-prompt	40.4	10479.3	97.5	3417.8	28.5	11673.3	99.7	1725.3
	COVE	64.6	6900.8	97.4	2798.8	37.6	9307	99.8	984.5
	COVER	92.3	2250.8	98.5	1589.3	77.2	3776	100	525.8
RoBERTa-large	rocket-prompt	49.1	10888.5	95.2	4828.25	15.9	13328.8	93.3	4043.5
	COVE	79.1	5719	91.1	4683	22.2	11376.8	96.2	2520
	COVER	96.1	1607.3	91.8	4369.5	31.7	10225	97.4	1994.25
Average Accuracy (%)		79.2		62.5		74.2		81.8	

Experimental Results Table 3 shows the performance of our proposed COVER. The ASR of COVER achieves an average accuracy of 96%, 94.1% and 75.3% in BERT-base, RoBERTa-base and RoBERTa-large, respectively, significantly outperforming that of rocket-prompt and COVE. And COVER has the least Query

times in all cases, where it is almost one-sixth of that of rocket-prompt and almost one-third to one-half of that of COVE in the Sentiment domain. This demonstrates the vulnerabilities of prompt-based learning where an attacker can corrupt PLM predictions through heuristic greedy means, which needs to be taken into account by real-world practitioners.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we explore black-box attacks for prompt-based learning, which carries more practical values. First, we design a series of heuristic template destruction rules at character-level and word-level. Then we propose a greedy strategy based on this to mimic real-world malicious attacks. And finally the experimental results justify the power of our approach in terms of both attack success rate and speed, exhibiting great vulnerability in prompt-based learning.

References

1. Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H., Neubig, G.: Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(9): 1–35 (2023)
2. Gao, T., Fisch, A., Chen, D.: Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15723* (2020)
3. Xu, L., Chen, Y., Cui, G., Gao, H., Liu, Z.: Exploring the Universal Vulnerability of Prompt-based Learning Paradigm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05239* (2022)
4. Shi, Y., Li, P., Yin, C., Han, Z., Zhou, L., Liu, Z.: PromptAttack: Prompt-Based Attack for Language Models via Gradient Search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01882* (2022)
5. Lee, D., Moon, S., Lee, J., Song, H.O.: Query-Efficient and Scalable Black-Box Adversarial Attacks on Discrete Sequential Data via Bayesian Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08575* (2022)
6. Chen, Y., Gao, H., Cui, G., Qi, F., Huang, L., Liu, Z., et al.: Why Should Adversarial Perturbations be Imperceptible? Rethink the Research Paradigm in Adversarial NLP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10683* (2022)
7. Devlin, J., Chang, M. W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018)
8. Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., et al.: Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019)
9. Loshchilov, I. and Hutter, F.: Fixing Weight Decay Regularization in Adam. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1711.05101* (2017)
10. Wang, A., Singh, A., Michael, J., Hill, F., Levy, O., Bowman, S.R.: GLUE: A Multi-Task Benchmark and Analysis Platform for Natural Language Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461* (2018)
11. Maas, A.L., Daly, R.E., Pham, P.T., Huang, D., Ng, A.Y., Potts, C.: Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In: *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*, pp. 142–150. Association for Computer Linguistics, Portland, Oregon, United States (2011)