

A Majority Invariant Approach to Patch Robustness Certification for Deep Learning Models

Qilin Zhou, Zhengyuan Wei, Haipeng Wang, and W.K. Chan
Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong
{qilin.zhou, zywei4-c, haipeng.wang}@my.cityu.edu.hk, wkchan@cityu.edu.hk

Abstract—Patch robustness certification ensures no patch within a given bound on a sample can manipulate a deep learning model to predict a different label. However, existing techniques cannot certify samples that cannot meet their strict bars at the classifier level or the patch region level. This paper proposes *MajorCert*. *MajorCert* firstly finds all possible label sets manipulatable by the same patch region on the same sample across the underlying classifiers, then enumerates their combinations element-wise, and finally checks whether the majority invariant of all these combinations is intact to certify samples.

Index Terms—Patch robustness, certification, invariant

I. INTRODUCTION

Patch adversarial attack on images, which modifies pixels in a patch region of a sample, is a critical threat in the real world [1]. Its defense techniques are under intensive study [2] and recently received increasing attention from the SE community [3], [4]. Empirical techniques [5], [6] are based on heuristics, whereas certified techniques [3], [7]–[19] have guarantee on robustness and are emerging. The latter has two broad categories of techniques: certified recovery is a harder problem than certified detection, which proves to recover the label of benign samples against a patch [16].

In this paper, we present a novel technique *MajorCert* for certified recovery. Existing techniques find a common safety margin between labels at the classifier level [10], [12]–[15] or check whether a malicious label exists at the patch region level [16]–[18]. A common safety margin is easy to check but overestimated due to the insensitivity of patch location. Checking at the patch region level gives a strictly tighter certification bound [17] but still fails if any malicious label exists, limiting its applicability. This paper proposes *MajorCert*. *MajorCert* finds the possible label sets manipulatable by the same patch region from the underlying classifiers, enumerates their combinations elementwise, and checks the *majority invariant* (see Lemma 2) to give a certification on a sample. Satisfying the majority invariant implies the sample is certifiably robust and the label could be recovered even if any patch therein (see Sec. III-B3).

Main contributions: (1) This paper is the first work to show the feasibility of certified recovery to certify a sample under the majority invariant condition even if malicious labels exist at the classifier level or the patch region level. (2) It presents *MajorCert* with its theory and a case study.

The rest of the paper will revisit the preliminaries (§II), present *MajorCert* (§III) and its evaluation (§IV), followed by reviewing related works (§V) and concluding this work (§VI).

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Image Classification Model, Attack, and Defense

An image sample x has w rows in height and h columns in width. A classifier f accepts x as input to predict its label c (denoted by $f(x)$). We define the indicator function $\mathbf{1}[z]$ to return 1 if the condition z holds, otherwise 0. We adopt the convention used in $\arg \max(\cdot)$ to return the label with a smaller label index for tie-breaking [12], modeled by the function $\mathbf{1}[c_i > c_j]$ where $c_i > c_j$ if indexes $i > j$.

A **patch region** in an image is represented by a binary matrix $p \in [0, 1]^{w \times h}$ where all the elements within the region are set to 1, otherwise 0. We follow prior works [12], [16] to focus on cases where the patch region is a square of side m (as a conservative estimate by a defense). We regard m as the size parameter of p . We define two samples x_1 and x_2 **differ** by p if and only if $(J-p) \cdot x_1 = (J-p) \cdot x_2$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ where \cdot is the element-wise product operator and J is an all-ones matrix [20] of the same dimension as p . An attacker aims to find a sample x_2 such that $f(x_2) \neq f(x_1)$. A defense aims to design a defender D such that $D(x_1) = D(x_2) = f(x_1)$ for every patched version x_2 of x_1 . We refer to such x_1 as a **certifiably robust sample** on D . As noted in [16], certified recovery needs to guarantee the recovery of the label of x_1 from x_2 , which is harder than merely detecting x_2 as adversarial.

B. Row, Column, and Block Ablation Strategies

An **ablation region** is represented by a binary matrix $\psi \in [0, 1]^{w \times h}$ like patch region. Applying ψ on a sample x creates an **ablation** b (i.e., $b = \psi \cdot x$). Existing work [12] studied three types of ablation regions: row, column, and block. A row ablation region r_i has width w and height s_r , spanning from rows i to $[i + (s_r - 1)] \bmod h$. A column ablation region c_j has height h and width s_c , spanning from columns j to $[j + (s_c - 1)] \bmod w$. A block ablation region $b_{i,j}$ is a square ablation region of side s_b , spanning from rows i to $[i + (s_b - 1)] \bmod h$ and columns j to $[j + (s_b - 1)] \bmod w$. Applying the above three rules for all $0 \leq i < h$ and $0 \leq j < w$ produces three sets of ablation regions Ψ_{a_r}, Ψ_{a_c} , and Ψ_{a_b} respectively, and applying Ψ_{a_r}, Ψ_{a_c} , and Ψ_{a_b} on a sample x produces three sets of ablations denoted by $\mathbb{B}(a_r, x)$, $\mathbb{B}(a_c, x)$, and $\mathbb{B}(a_b, x)$, respectively. We refer to these three **strategies** to create ablations as a_r , a_c , and a_b , and use the notation \mathbb{A} to represent a set of ablation strategies.

Algorithm 1: MajorCert

Input : $\mathbb{A} \leftarrow$ set of ablation strategies,
 $\mathbb{M} \leftarrow$ map of pretrained models (\mathbb{A} as keys),
 $\mathbb{R} \leftarrow$ map of ablation region sets (\mathbb{A} as keys),
 $x \leftarrow$ test sample,
Output: $y \leftarrow$ prediction label,
 $cert \leftarrow$ certification tag

- 1 $V \leftarrow \{\}$
- 2 **foreach** $a \in \mathbb{A}$ **do**
- 3 $\mathbb{B}(a, x) \leftarrow \langle b | b = x \cdot \psi \wedge \psi \in \Psi_a \wedge \Psi_a = \mathbb{R}.get(a) \rangle$
- 4 $V[a] \leftarrow \langle f^a(b) | b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x) \wedge f^a = \mathbb{M}.get(a) \rangle$
- 5 **end**
- 6 $y \leftarrow \text{COMPUTELABEL}(V)$
- 7 $cert \leftarrow \text{MAJORITYCERTIFICATION}(V)$
- 8 **if** $cert = \text{False}$ **then**
- 9 $cert \leftarrow \text{MAJORITYINVARIANTCERTIFICATION}(V)$
- 10 **end**
- 11 **return** $y, cert$

We let f^a be a classifier trained on the set $\cup_{x \in T} \mathbb{B}(a, x)$ using the strategy $a \in \mathbb{A}$ and a training dataset T , and let the indicator function $f_c^a(x)$ yield 1 if $f^a(x) = c$, otherwise 0.

C. DeRandomized Smoothing (DRS)

DRS [12] is an ensemble-based technique. Given a classifier f^a , it accepts a test sample x as input, produces the ablation set $\mathbb{B}(a, x)$ from x , predicts a label c for x using the function $D_{DRS}^a(x)$, and reports whether x is certifiably robust.

$$D_{DRS}^a(x) = \arg \max_c n_c(x) \text{ where } n_c(x) = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x)} f_c^a(b)$$

DRS proves that x is certifiably robust if $D_{DRS}^a(x) = c$ and $n_c(x) \geq 2\Delta + \max_{c' \neq c} [n_{c'}(x) + 1[c > c']]$, where $\Delta = m + s_r(s_c) - 1$ for row (column) ablation and $\Delta = (m + s_b - 1)^2$ for block ablation [12]. DRS directly computes Δ based on the size parameter of patch region m and the size parameter of the ablation region s_r, s_c, s_b that creates its f^a for checking. If the above condition holds, it reports x is certifiably robust.

D. Conservative upper and lower bounds on a label

Suppose two samples x_1 and x_2 differ by p , and b is an ablation produced by ψ in the ablation set $\mathbb{B}(a, x_1)$. If p overlaps with ψ (i.e., $\psi \cdot p \neq O$ where O is a zero matrix of the same dimension as p), then the pair of labels returned by $f^a(x_1 \cdot \psi)$ and $f^a(x_2 \cdot \psi)$ may be different, otherwise keeps the same. We define the subset of $\mathbb{B}(a, x_1)$ in which ψ of each b doesn't overlap with p (which also means $b \cdot p = O$) as X . Thus, the number of ablations in X predicted to a label c represents a **lower bound** $\underline{n}_c(x_1, a, p)$ on the number of ablations of x_2 predicted to c by f^a , defined as: $\underline{n}_c(x_1, a, p) = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x_1) \wedge b \cdot p = O} f_c^a(b)$. Similarly, the corresponding **upper bound** $\overline{n}_c(x_1, a, p)$ is counted as the number of ablations in X predicted to c by f^a plus the total number of remaining ablations in $\mathbb{B}(a, x_1)/X$, defined as: $\overline{n}_c(x_1, a, p) = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x_1) \wedge b \cdot p = O} f_c^a(b) + \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x_1)} 1[b \cdot p \neq O]$.




Fig. 1. MajorCert compares to DRS [12] and PG [16] on a sample with its ablations' predictions when using the column, row, and block ablation strategies from top to bottom. Neighbour ablations will overlap practically but are omitted here. The ablations in white and grey stand for prediction to two different class labels. Scenarios (a) and (b) stand for two situations with a patch region (black square) on the sample. See Section III.B for the definitions of LOCAL and MAY. In the column and block ablation cases, non-empty LOCAL sets fail PG, and insufficient margins fail DRS. *MajorCert* certifies the sample even if the MAY sets contain local-malicious labels and if the majority of DRS (PG) defenders fail to do so.

III. MAJORCERT

A. Overview

MajorCert consists of label prediction and two certification analyses. In the main algorithm (Alg. 1), *MajorCert* first creates an empty map V to contain prediction results and then generates the prediction label for each ablation b under each ablation strategy a (lines 1–5) for the input sample x . It then predicts the final label (line 6, see Sec. III-B1) and checks whether over half of the DRS defenders (one for each ablation strategy) can certify x (line 7, see Sec. III-B2). If this is not the case (line 8), it conducts the majority invariant certification analysis (line 9, see Sec. III-B3) to generate a certification tag. Line 11 returns the label and the certification tag. Fig. 1 illustrates how *MajorCert* compares to existing techniques.

B. Certification Analysis

1) *Prediction Label*: *MajorCert* predicts a label via the function $D_{MC}(x)$, where x is a test sample, and all classifiers f^a for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$ share the same training dataset T .

$$D_{MC}(x) = \arg \max_c \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[\arg \max_{c'} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x)} f_c^a(b) = c] \quad (1)$$

The function $\text{COMPUTELABEL}(\cdot)$ in Alg. 1 puts the label having the largest number of instances in $V[a]$ for each a into an initially empty map, followed by finding the label having the largest number of instances in this map, i.e., computing $D_{MC}(x)$ as $\arg \max_c \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[\arg \max_{c'} \sum_{v \in V[a]} 1[v = c']] = c]$, which is equivalent to Eq. (1).

2) *Majority Certification Analysis*: Like [16], our majority certification analysis is built atop DRS [12]. We regard patch size m as known by all and omit it. Given a classifier f^a , an input x , and a label c , we let $\theta_c^a(x)$ denote the indicator function that returns 1 if both $D_{DRS}^a(x) = c$ and the defender D_{DRS}^a for the ensemble $\arg \max_c \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a, x)} f_c^a(b)$ reports x as certifiably robust, otherwise returns 0.

Theorem 1 states that if more than half of the defenders D_{DRS}^a for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$ certify the sample for the same label, then our technique also certifies the sample. It is a direct consequence of using an ensemble over a set of defenders.

Theorem 1 (majority certification analysis). *A sample x is certifiably robust on $D_{MC}(\cdot)$ if $\exists c$, s.t. $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} \theta_c^a(x) > |\mathbb{A}|/2$.*

Proof. Suppose x_1 and x_2 differ by p and c_1 is a label satisfying the condition $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} \theta_{c_1}^a(x_1) > |\mathbb{A}|/2$. For x_1 , we know if $\theta_{c_1}^a(x_1) = 1$, then $D_{DRS}^a(x_1) = c_1$. So from the given condition, we know over half of the classifiers return c_1 . Thus, $D_{MC}(x_1) = \arg \max_c [\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[D_{DRS}^a(x_1) = c]] = c_1$. For x_2 , we know if $\theta_{c_1}^a(x_1) = 1$, then $f^a(x_2) = f^a(x_1)$ for any patched version x_2 of x_1 . Thus $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} [1[D_{DRS}^a(x_2) = c_1]] \geq \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} \theta_{c_1}^a(x_1) > |\mathbb{A}|/2$, where over half of the classifiers must return c_1 for x_2 . Finally, we have $D_{MC}(x_2) = \arg \max_c [\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[D_{DRS}^a(x_2) = c]] = c_1$. \square

The function MAJORITYCERTIFICATION(.) in Alg. 1 counts the number of instances of each label in $V[a]$, checks whether the DRS’s condition of patch robustness certification (see Sec. II-C) for each ablation strategy a holds. It then reports *True* if the condition in Theorem 1 holds, otherwise *False*.

3) *Majority Invariant Analysis:* *MajorCert* checks label combinations, which is finer in granularity than checking at the patch region level [16] or the classifier level [12], thereby thus producing a more accurate analysis.

Let the function $g^a(\cdot)$ represent the inner $\arg \max$ term ($= \arg \max_{c'} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x)} f_c^a(b)$) in Eq. (1) for each $a \in \mathbb{A}$. Suppose x_1 and x_2 differ by p and $g^a(x_1) = c$. A local-malicious label c_l for $g^a(\cdot)$ and x_1 is caused by those ablations which are overlapped with p . The idea is to check whether the lower bound on the number of ablations predicted to label c is smaller than the upper bound on the number of ablations predicted to another label (e.g., c_l). If that is the case, $g^a(x_2)$ may return c_l instead of c . Definition 1 captures this property.

Definition 1 (local-malicious label). *Let x_1 be a sample, suppose $g^a(x_1)$ returns a label c . A label $c_l \neq c$ is called a local-malicious label of x_1 for $g^a(\cdot)$ with respect to a given p if and only if $\underline{n}_c(x_1, a, p) < \overline{n}_{c_l}(x_1, a, p) + 1[c > c_l]$, where $1[c > c_l]$ is for tie-breaking. We let $\text{LOCAL}(x, a, p)$ denote the set of local-malicious labels of x for $g^a(\cdot)$ and p .*

Suppose x_1 and x_2 differ by p . Then, $g^a(x_2)$ should return a label in the set $\text{LOCAL}(x_1, a, p)$ or the original label $g^a(x_1)$. Lemma 1 captures this relation.

Lemma 1. *Let x_1 be a sample and p represent a patch region. Suppose $g^a(x_1) = c_1$. If x_1 and x_2 differ by p , then the condition $g^a(x_2) \in \text{LOCAL}(x_1, a, p) \cup \{c_1\}$ holds.*

Proof. Suppose $g^a(x_2) = c_2 \notin \text{LOCAL}(x_1, a, p) \cup \{c_1\}$. By Definition 1, we know the condition $\underline{n}_{c_1}(x_1, a, p) \geq \overline{n}_{c_2}(x_1, a, p) + 1[c_1 > c_2]$ holds, which can be further rewritten into $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_1) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_1}^a(b) \geq \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_1) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_2}^a(b) + \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_1)} 1[b \cdot p \neq O] + 1[c_1 > c_2]$. Since x_1 and x_2 differ by p , the condition $(J - p) \cdot x_1 = (J - p) \cdot x_2$ holds, which implies $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_1) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_c^a(b) = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_c^a(b)$ holds for all c . We then also have $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_1)} 1[b \cdot p \neq O] = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2)} 1[b \cdot p \neq O]$, which implies $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_c^a(b) \leq \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2)} 1[b \cdot p \neq O] = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_1)} 1[b \cdot p \neq O]$ holds for all c . So, we have $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_1}^a(b) \geq \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_2}^a(b) +$

$\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_2}^a(b) + 1[c_1 > c_2]$, which implies $\sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_1}^a(b) \geq \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2) \wedge b \cdot p \neq O} f_{c_2}^a(b) + 1[c_1 > c_2]$. Then, we have $g^a(x_2) \neq c_2$ from the definition of $g^a(\cdot)$, contradicting to $g^a(x_2) = c_2$. \square

We define the set $\mathbb{E}_p(x)$ (for each patch region represented by p in each index) to contain all combinations of the following sets $\text{MAY}(x, a, p) = \text{LOCAL}(x, a, p) \cup \{g^a(x)\}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$ elementwise: $\mathbb{E}_p(x) = \{\langle c \in \text{MAY}(x, a, p) \rangle_{a \in \mathbb{A}}\}$. (E.g., Suppose $\mathbb{A} = \{a_r, a_c, a_b\}$, $\text{MAY}(x, a_r, p) = \{c_1, c_2\}$, $\text{MAY}(x, a_c, p) = \{c_2\}$, and $\text{MAY}(x, a_b, p) = \{c_2, c_3\}$. Then, $\mathbb{E}_p(x) = \{\langle c_1, c_2, c_2 \rangle, \langle c_1, c_2, c_3 \rangle, \langle c_2, c_2, c_2 \rangle, \langle c_2, c_2, c_3 \rangle\}$.) Suppose x_1 and x_2 differ by p and the label produced by $D_{MC}(x_1)$ always receives the largest count (also considering tie-breaking cases) in every combination in $\mathbb{E}_p(x_1)$. Recall that $D_{MC}(x_2)$ for any x_2 from x_1 differ by p should eventually produce a label that receives the largest count in $\langle g^a(x_2) \mid \forall a \in \mathbb{A} \rangle$, which must be one of the combinations in $\mathbb{E}_p(x_1)$. So, the label produced by $D_{MC}(x_2)$ should be same as the label produced by $D_{MC}(x_1)$. Lemma 2 captures this insight, which leads to Theorem 2.

Lemma 2. *Let x_1 be a sample and p represent a patch region. If the condition $\arg \max_c [\sum_{c' \in e} 1[c' = c]] = D_{MC}(x_1)$ holds for all $e \in \mathbb{E}_p(x_1)$, called the **majority invariant**, then $D_{MC}(x_2) = D_{MC}(x_1)$ holds for any pairs of x_2 and x_1 differing by p .*

Proof. By Lemma 1, the label returned by $g^a(x_2)$ for all x_2 should be a label in the set $\text{MAY}(x_1, a, p)$. Recall $\mathbb{E}_p(x)$ contains all possible combinations of the sets $\text{MAY}(x, a, p)$ and $g^a(x) = \arg \max_c \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x)} f_c^a(b)$. Then, we have $D_{MC}(x_2) = \arg \max_c [\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[\arg \max_{c'} \sum_{b \in \mathbb{B}(a,x_2)} f_c^a(b) = c]] = \arg \max_c [\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[g_a(x_2) = c]]$, which is an element in the set $\{\arg \max_c [\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}} 1[c' = c]] \mid c' \in \text{MAY}(x_1, a, p)\} = \{\arg \max_c [\sum_{c' \in e} 1[c' = c]] \mid e \in \mathbb{E}_p(x_1)\}$ (by the definition of $\mathbb{E}_p(x)$). Recall the condition $\arg \max_c [\sum_{c' \in e} 1[c' = c]] = D_{MC}(x_1)$ holds for all $e \in \mathbb{E}_p(x_1)$. So, we obtain $D_{MC}(x_2) = D_{MC}(x_1)$. \square

Theorem 2 (majority invariant analysis). *Given a sample x , if Lemma 2 holds for all patch regions, then x is certifiably robust on D_{MC} .*

Proof. It directly follows Lemma 2. \square

MAJORITYINVARIANTCERTIFICATION(.) in Alg. 1 enumerates all label combinations in $\mathbb{E}_p(x)$ (generated from the sets $V[a]$ for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$ and the set of patch regions based on a given patch size), checks whether the majority invariant condition in Lemma 2 holds for each combination in $\mathbb{E}_p(x)$ for all patch regions, and reports *True* if that is the case, otherwise *False*. It certifies samples even if Theorem 1 cannot apply. We note that the function is able to report a sample is certifiably robust even if the majority of DRS defenders fail to do so.

IV. EVALUATION

A. Setup

We implement *MajorCert* on Pytorch 1.13.0 and conduct the case study on a Ubuntu 20.04 server with a 48-core 3.0GHz

TABLE I
CLEAN ACCURACY AND CERTIFIED ROBUST ACCURACY IN CIFAR10

Patch size	2×2		5×5		Mean Clean	Mean Robust	
	Clean	Robust	Clean	Robust			
PG-DRS [16]	84.7%	69.2%	84.6%	57.7%	84.7%	63.5%	
DRS [16]	83.9%	68.9%	83.9%	56.2%	83.9%	62.6%	
PG-BN [16]	84.5%	63.8%	83.9%	47.3%	84.2%	55.6%	
IBP [9]	65.8%	51.9%	47.8%	30.3%	56.8%	41.1%	
CBN [9]	83.2%	51.0%	83.2%	16.2%	83.2%	33.6%	
MC*	88.1%	71.1%	88.1%	57.8%	88.1%	5.4x 64.5%	11x
PG-DRS [†]	87.3%	69.7%	84.5%	57.2%	85.9%	1x 63.5%	1x
DRS [†]	86.6%	69.6%	84.2%	57.1%	85.4%	- 63.4%	-

Xeon CPU, 256GB RAM, and 4 2080Ti GPU cards. The implementation of *MajorCert* is available in [21].

Datasets. We adopt the CIFAR10 dataset [22]: 50000 training and 10000 test samples. We divide the training samples into our training and validation sets using a random 4:1 split.

Ablation strategy. We adopt the row, column, and block ablation strategies of DRS [12] to produce three DeRandomized Smoothing (DRS) defenders. The hyperparameters follow the optimal ones in [12]: logits abstention threshold = 0.3, column size = 4 and block size = 12. We set row size = column size due to their similarity. We apply PatchGuard (PG) [16] and *MajorCert* based on these DRS defenders. (The code of PG [23] does not support the block strategy of DRS.)

Models, techniques, and hyperparameters. We adopt the ResNet18 [24] implementation in the DRS repository [25] as the model architecture, the original implementations and hyperparameters of DRS [25] and PG-DRS [23], and the training script of DRS [25]. We set the number of epochs and batch size to 450 and 128. The learning rate is set to 0.1 and reduced by a factor of 10 at epochs {150, 250, 350}.

Evaluation metrics. *Clean accuracy* is the fraction of test samples with correct prediction labels. *Certified robust accuracy* is the fraction of test samples whose prediction labels are correct and are certifiably robust against any square patch of size m . We study $m \times m = 2 \times 2$ and 5×5 , which are consistent with previous works [12], [16].

B. Results and Data Analysis

Table I shows the patch robustness certification results achieved by *MajorCert* (MC), DRS [12], and PG-DRS [16] (the last three rows) in our case study, and shows the best results of DRS, PG, Interval Bound Propagation (IBP) [11], and Clipped BagNet (CBN) [18] in the literature.

In Table I, MC outperforms all peer techniques in clean and certified robust accuracy. Both MC and PG develop atop DRS. MC achieves 3.6% higher clean accuracy and 0.6% higher certified robust accuracy against a 5×5 patch, and 0.8% higher clean accuracy and 1.4% higher certified robust accuracy against a 2×2 patch than PG. Suppose we normalize the accuracy improvement of PG atop DRS in our case study to 1. The improvements achieved by MC are 5.4x in clean

*MC will achieve the same accuracy as this row if MAJORITYCERTIFICATION in line 7 of Algorithm 1 is disabled.

[†]We select PG-DRS with best certified robust accuracy and its corresponding results on DRS.




Fig. 2. CIFAR-10 clean accuracy (x -axis) and certified robust accuracy (y -axis) achieved by MC, PG, and DRS.

accuracy and 11x in certified robust accuracy. From Table I, advancing the state in patch robustness certification appears to be a hard problem since PG can only slightly improve DRS.

Fig. 2 further shows the breakdown by ablation strategy used by PG and DRS in our case study. PG’s improvement over DRS is inconsistent across ablation strategies. Across the two plots, PG is more effective than DRS using row ablation but not column ablation. DRS is always the most effective when using block ablation in clean accuracy but not certified robust accuracy. MC builds on top of all the above DRSs and consistently outperforms all peer techniques in the case study.

V. RELATED WORK

IBP [11] is the first certified defense against patches. DRS [12] predicts a label for each ablation as the vote. It then uses the label receiving the largest votes as output and proves a common safety margin for certification. If the margin of votes between the largest and second largest is large enough, no patch within a given bound can affect the prediction label. PatchGuard [16] is built atop either DRS [12] or BagNet [26]. It constructs a heuristic mask on prediction vectors to mask out high values in those vectors to empirically improve the accuracy. It then aggregates the vectors after masking to produce the prediction label and scans for each patch region to check whether the malicious label exists similar to *MajorCert*. But different from *MajorCert*, if it finds any malicious labels, it cannot certify the scanned sample. The work of Salman et al. [13] combines the certification analysis of DRS with Vision Transformer architecture (ViT) instead of ResNet architecture to achieve higher accuracy empirically. As noted in [10], further analysis is required to reveal why ViT outperforms ResNet in this problem. PatchCleanser [19] connects certified detection and certified recovery with a two-stage certification analysis. VIP [10] is also a ViT-based proposal for both certified detection and certified recovery, but still following the line of DRS to find a common margin for certified recovery.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented *MajorCert*, a novel patch robustness certification technique. We have proven its correctness and testified its effectiveness through a case study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is partly supported by the CityU MF_EXT (project no. 9678180). W.K. Chan is the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. B. Brown, D. Mané, A. Roy, M. Abadi, and J. Gilmer, “Adversarial patch,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.09665*, 2017.
- [2] A. Sharma, Y. Bian, P. Munz, and A. Narayan, “Adversarial patch attacks and defenses in vision-based tasks: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08304*, 2022.
- [3] Y. Huang, L. Ma, and Y. Li, “Patchcensor: Patch robustness certification for transformers via exhaustive testing,” *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 2023.
- [4] H. Zhou, W. Li, Z. Kong, J. Guo, Y. Zhang, B. Yu, L. Zhang, and C. Liu, “Deepbillboard: Systematic physical-world testing of autonomous driving systems,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*, pp. 347–358, 2020.
- [5] M. Naseer, S. Khan, and F. Porikli, “Local gradients smoothing: Defense against localized adversarial attacks,” in *2019 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pp. 1300–1307, IEEE, 2019.
- [6] J. Hayes, “On visible adversarial perturbations & digital watermarking,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pp. 1597–1604, 2018.
- [7] M. McCoyd, W. Park, S. Chen, N. Shah, R. Roggenkemper, M. Hwang, J. X. Liu, and D. Wagner, “Minority reports defense: Defending against adversarial patches,” in *Applied Cryptography and Network Security Workshops: ACNS 2020 Satellite Workshops, AIBlock, AIHWS, AIoTS, Cloud S&P, SCI, SecMT, and SiMLA, Rome, Italy, October 19–22, 2020, Proceedings*, pp. 564–582, Springer, 2020.
- [8] C. Xiang and P. Mittal, “Patchguard++: Efficient provable attack detection against adversarial patches,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12609*, 2021.
- [9] H. Han, K. Xu, X. Hu, X. Chen, L. Liang, Z. Du, Q. Guo, Y. Wang, and Y. Chen, “Scalecert: Scalable certified defense against adversarial patches with sparse superficial layers,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 28169–28181, 2021.
- [10] J. Li, H. Zhang, and C. Xie, “Vip: Unified certified detection and recovery for patch attack with vision transformers,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXV*, pp. 573–587, Springer, 2022.
- [11] P. yeh Chiang*, R. Ni*, A. Abdelkader, C. Zhu, C. Studor, and T. Goldstein, “Certified defenses for adversarial patches,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [12] A. Levine and S. Feizi, “(de) randomized smoothing for certifiable defense against patch attacks,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 6465–6475, 2020.
- [13] H. Salman, S. Jain, E. Wong, and A. Madry, “Certified patch robustness via smoothed vision transformers,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 15137–15147, 2022.
- [14] Z. Chen, B. Li, J. Xu, S. Wu, S. Ding, and W. Zhang, “Towards practical certifiable patch defense with vision transformer,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 15148–15158, 2022.
- [15] W.-Y. Lin, F. Sheikholeslami, L. Rice, J. Z. Kolter, *et al.*, “Certified robustness against adversarial patch attacks via randomized cropping,” in *ICML 2021 Workshop on Adversarial Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [16] C. Xiang, A. N. Bhagoji, V. Schwag, and P. Mittal, “Patchguard: A provably robust defense against adversarial patches via small receptive fields and masking,” in *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pp. 2237–2254, 2021.
- [17] J. H. Metzen and M. Yatsura, “Efficient certified defenses against patch attacks on image classifiers,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [18] Z. Zhang, B. Yuan, M. McCoyd, and D. Wagner, “Clipped bagnet: Defending against sticker attacks with clipped bag-of-features,” in *2020 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*, pp. 55–61, IEEE, 2020.
- [19] C. Xiang, S. Mahloujifar, and P. Mittal, “Patchcleanser: Certifiably robust defense against adversarial patches for any image classifier,” in *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pp. 2065–2082, 2022.
- [20] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [21] <https://github.com/kio-cs/MajorCert>.
- [22] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton, *et al.*, “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images,” 2009.
- [23] C. Xiang, A. N. Bhagoji, V. Schwag, and P. Mittal, “Code for paper ”patchguard: A provably robust defense against adversarial patches via small receptive fields and masking”,” <https://github.com/inspire-group/PatchGuard>.
- [24] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016.
- [25] A. Levine and S. Feizi, “Code for the paper (de)randomized smoothing for certifiable defense against patch attacks.” <https://github.com/alevine0/patchSmoothing>.
- [26] W. Brendel and M. Bethge, “Approximating CNNs with bag-of-local-features models works surprisingly well on imagenet,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.