

# ESPRESSO: Robust Concept Filtering in Text-to-Image Models

Anudeep Das<sup>1</sup>, Vasisht Duddu<sup>1</sup>, Rui Zhang<sup>2\*</sup>, N. Asokan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Waterloo, <sup>2</sup>Zhejiang University

{anudeep.das, vasisht.duddu}@uwaterloo.ca, zhangrui98@zju.edu.cn, asokan@acm.org

## Abstract

Diffusion based text-to-image models are trained on large datasets scraped from the Internet, potentially containing unacceptable concepts (e.g., copyright infringing or unsafe). We need concept removal techniques (CRTs) which are i) effective in preventing the generation of images with unacceptable concepts, ii) utility-preserving on acceptable concepts, and, iii) robust against evasion with adversarial prompts. None of the prior CRTs satisfy all these requirements simultaneously. We introduce ESPRESSO, the first **robust concept filter** based on Contrastive Language-Image Pre-Training (CLIP). We configure CLIP to identify unacceptable concepts in generated images using the distance of their embeddings to the text embeddings of both unacceptable and acceptable concepts. This lets us fine-tune for robustness by separating the text embeddings of unacceptable and acceptable concepts while preserving their pairing with image embeddings for utility. We present a pipeline to evaluate various CRTs, attacks against them, and show that ESPRESSO, is **more effective and robust** than prior CRTs, while retaining utility.

## 1. Introduction

Diffusion-based text-to-image (T2I) models have demonstrated a remarkable ability to generate high quality images from textual prompts [35, 37, 38]. They are trained on large datasets of unfiltered content from the Internet [34, 40]. Due to their large capacity, T2I models memorize specific *concepts*, as seen in the generated images [2, 21, 41]. Some of these concepts, may be *unacceptable* for various reasons, such as copyright infringement (e.g., a movie character or celebrity), or inappropriateness (e.g., “nudity” or “violence”) [10, 15, 39]. We need *concept removal techniques* (CRTs) to minimize unacceptable concepts in generated images.

Ideally, CRTs should be *effective* in reducing the generation of unacceptable concepts while preserving the *util-*

*ity* on all others, and *robust* to evasion with adversarial prompts. As we show in Section 6, no existing CRT *simultaneously* satisfies these requirements: i) *fine-tuning CRTs* which modify T2I models, trade-off effectiveness for utility [10, 15, 22, 39], and lack robustness [31, 42, 45, 49], ii) *filtering CRTs*, which detect unacceptable concepts, lack robustness ([36] and Section 6.3). Our goal is to design a CRT that can simultaneously meet all the requirements.

We opt to use a filter as it will not alter the T2I model, thus minimizing impact on utility. We construct our filter using a Contrastive Language-Image Pre-Training (CLIP) model [34], an essential component of T2I models. CLIP is pre-trained on a vast dataset which encodes a broad spectrum of concepts [34], making it a versatile choice for a filter, unlike specialized classifiers (e.g., [50]). However, a naive CLIP-based filter is susceptible to evasion [36]. Subsequently, prior works have identified the design of a robust filtering-based CRT as an open problem [25, 36].

We present a **robust content filter**, ESPRESSO, by configuring CLIP to identify unacceptable concepts in generated images using the distance of their embeddings to the text embeddings of *both* unacceptable and acceptable concepts. This allows fine-tuning for better robustness by increasing the separation between the text embeddings of unacceptable and acceptable concepts, while preserving utility by maintaining their pairing with their corresponding image embeddings. Our contributions are presenting i) ESPRESSO, the **first robust content filter** (Section 4), ii) *a pipeline* to evaluate state-of-the-art CRTs and attacks (Section 5), iii) and a comprehensive evaluation of ESPRESSO against six fine-tuning CRTs, and one filtering CRT, showing that it is **more effective and robust** while **retaining utility** (Section 6). In Appendix A we present the *first* approach for *certifiable robustness of CRTs* by exploring theoretical robustness bounds of ESPRESSO with a hypothetically strong adversary. We empirically analyze these bounds to show that ESPRESSO is likely to be more robust in practice.

\*Work done while visiting the University of Waterloo

## 2. Background and Related Work

### 2.1. Diffusion based T2I Models

A diffusion based T2I model is a function  $f : p \rightarrow x$  which generates an image  $x$  for a given a textual prompt  $p$ . It comprises two key components: a text and image encoder ( $\phi$ ) which is used to incorporate the textual prompt in the image generation process, and a diffusion model ( $\epsilon_\theta$ ) which is responsible for the generation of the image.

A popular encoder is CLIP, trained on a large dataset of image-text pairs, to map the embeddings of images and their corresponding text closer together in a joint text-image embedding space [34]. We denote the image embeddings as  $\phi_x()$  and text embeddings as  $\phi_p()$ . CLIP is trained to maximize the cosine similarity ( $\cos(\phi_p(p_j), \phi_x(x_j))$ ) between the embedding of a prompt  $p_j$  ( $\phi_p(p_j)$ ) and the embedding of its corresponding image  $x_j$  ( $\phi_x(x_j)$ ) while minimizing the similarity between  $\phi_p(p_j)$  and any other  $\phi_x(x_k)$  for  $k \neq j$ . To achieve this, CLIP is trained using a contrastive loss function ( $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Con}}$ ) [24, 34, 43, 47].

Given access to a pre-trained encoder, the actual images in T2I models are generated by a diffusion model,  $\epsilon_\theta$ , parameterized by  $\theta$ . During inference,  $\epsilon_\theta$  generates an image from noise and can be conditioned with the embedding of a textual prompt  $\phi_p(p)$  to guide the generation of the image to match the description in  $p$ .

### 2.2. Concept Removal Techniques

The textual phrase for an acceptable concept is  $c^a$ , and for an unacceptable concept is  $c^u$ . For a given  $c^u$ , we define  $c^a$  as either the opposite, e.g.,  $c^u = \textit{violence}$  vs.  $c^a = \textit{peaceful}$ , or a generalization of a specific instance, e.g.,  $c^u = \textit{R2D2}$  vs.  $c^a = \textit{robot}$  (discussed later in Section 5.3). A T2I model may generate an image containing an unacceptable concept (referred to as  $x^u$ ) or an acceptable one (referred to as  $x^a$ ). Similarly, a text prompt  $p$  may contain a phrase for an acceptable concept ( $p^a$ ) or an unacceptable concept ( $p^u$ ). An example of  $p^u$  containing an unacceptable concept  $c^u = \textit{Captain Marvel}$ , is “*Captain Marvel* soaring through the sky”. CRTs seek to thwart the generation of  $x^u$  by either fine-tuning the T2I model to suppress  $x^u$ , or using a classifier as a filter to detect and replace  $x^u$ . We discuss six state-of-the-art fine-tuning CRTs: CONCEPT AB- LATION (CA) [22] minimizes the KL divergence between the model’s output for  $p^u$  and  $p^a$  to force the generation of  $x^a$  instead of  $x^u$ ; FORGET-ME-NOT (FMN) [51] minimizes the activation maps for  $c^u$  by modifying  $\epsilon_\theta$ ’s cross-attention layers; SELECTIVE AMNESIA (SA) [15] adapts continuous learning techniques (elastic weight consolidation and generative replay) for T2I models to forget a concept; ERASED STABLE DIFFUSION (ESD) [10] modifies the diffusion process to reduce the probability of generating  $x^u$ ; UNIFIED CONCEPT EDITING (UCE) [13] fine-tunes the

cross-attention layers to minimize the influence of  $c^u$ ; SAFE DIFFUSION (SDD) [19] encourages the diffusion model output conditioned on  $c^u$  to match the unconditioned output. All current fine-tuning CRTs trade-off effectiveness for utility [10, 15, 22, 39] and are not robust (see Section 2.3).

We also discuss two state-of-the-art filtering CRTs. STABLE DIFFUSION FILTER (SD-Filter) [34] is black-box and the design of the filter is not publicly available, but Rando et. al. [36] hypothesize that it involves computing the cosine similarity between the embeddings of a generated image,  $x$ , and a pre-defined set of  $c^u$ . If the cosine similarity is greater than some threshold, then  $x$  has  $c^u$ . UNSAFE DIFFUSION (UD) [50] is the current state-of-the-art filtering CRT and outperforms the SD-Filter [50]. UD trains a multi-headed neural network classifier on top of CLIP to identify  $x^u$  where each head classifies different  $c^u$ : *nudity, violence, disturbing, hateful, and political*. In Section 6.3, we show that UD is not robust.

### 2.3. Evading Concept Removal Techniques

An adversary  $Adv$  may construct adversarial prompts ( $p^{adv}$ ) to evade CRTs and force the T2I model to generate  $x^u$ .  $Adv$  is assumed to know and account for the target T2I model  $f$  and its CRT. A dumb  $Adv$  who does not account for this is *naïve*. Existing attacks formulate the construction of  $p^{adv}$  as an optimization problem using some reference  $x^u$  (or the difference between  $p^a$  and  $p^u$ ) as the ground truth. PEZ [45] constructs  $p^{adv}$  by identifying text tokens which minimize the cosine similarity between  $\phi_p(p^{adv})$  and  $\phi_x(x^u)$ . RingBell [42] identifies tokens for  $p^{adv}$  by first calculating the average difference between the embedding vectors of  $p^u$  and  $p^a$  and then minimizes the distance of  $p^{adv}$ ’s text embedding to  $p^u$ ’s embedding using a genetic algorithm. SneakyPrompt [49] uses reinforcement learning to construct  $p^{adv}$  (starting from some initial  $p^u$ ) specifically against filtering CRTs using cosine similarity between  $\phi_x(x^{adv})$  and  $\phi_p(p^{adv})$  as the reward function. CCE [31] uses textual-inversion [8] to construct  $p^{adv}$  by updating CLIP’s vocabulary to include a new token “<s>” which generates  $Adv$ ’s desired image. All these attacks are effective against fine-tuning CRTs in Section 2.2. In Section 5.1, we enhance two naïve attacks, RingBell and PEZ, to defeat all these CRTs, including UD.

SurrogatePrompt [1] is a recent attack against a CRT in a commercial T2I systems that targets input filters, not output filters like ESPRESSO. Therefore we omit it in our robustness evaluation.

## 3. Problem Statement

Our goal is to design a CRT which can effectively detect  $x^u$  from T2I models.

**Adversary Model.** We consider a deployed target T2I model ( $f$ ) to which a client has blackbox access to send an

input ( $p$ ) and obtain a generated image ( $x$ ). Further,  $f$  uses some CRT. The goal of the adversary ( $Adv$ ) is to force  $f$  to generate  $x^u$  despite the presence of a CRT to suppress it. We give an advantage to  $Adv$  by allowing whitebox access to a local identical copy of  $f$  with the CRT for use in designing attacks. This is reasonable as  $\epsilon_\theta$  and CLIP are publicly available. For filtering CRTs, we assume that  $Adv$  has whitebox access to the filter to use its loss function in designing the attacks.

**Requirements** An ideal CRT should be: **R1** *Effective* in minimizing the generation of  $x^u$ ; **R2** *Utility-preserving*, maintaining the quality of acceptable images (for fine-tuning CRTs) or not blocking them (for filtering CRTs); and **R3** *Robust* against evasion with  $p^{adv}$ .

**Limitations of Prior Works.** We summarize the limitations of prior works which are empirically evaluated later in Section 6. *Fine-tuning CRTs* modify  $f$  thereby explicitly creating a trade-off between **R1** and **R2** [10, 13, 15, 15, 19, 22, 51]. Further, most of these CRTs do not consider **R3** in their design and are susceptible to evasion by  $Adv$  with  $p^{adv}$ . *Filtering CRTs* [34, 50] detect unacceptable concepts either in  $p$  (aka prompt filter) or in  $x$  and block them (a.k.a image filter). Since, they do not modify  $f$ , they can maintain **R2** without impacting **R1**. Prior filtering approaches may not be accurate in detecting unacceptable concepts (poor **R1**) [25] and can be easily evaded (poor **R3**) ([36] and Section 6.3). Further, the current state-of-the-art filter, UD [50], trains specialized classifiers for each concept on substantial data, which limits their generalization to new concepts.

## 4. ESPRESSO: Robust Filtering CRT

We present ESPRESSO, a robust concept filtering CRT. ESPRESSO uses a classifier  $F$  to detect images and filter unacceptable concepts in generated images. Following Stable Diffusion v1.4 (SDv1.4) [37], on detecting an unacceptable concept, ESPRESSO generates a replacement image [34,36]. We identify CLIP as the natural choice for such a classifier as it is (a) pre-trained on a large dataset covering a wide range of concepts, and (b) used across many T2I models, and encodes similar information as seen in them. Hence, CLIP is a better choice for a filter than training specialized classifiers for each concept (e.g., [50]).

However, simply using CLIP for ESPRESSO is not sufficient as seen in SDv1.4’s filter ( $F_{SD}$ ) [34].  $F_{SD}$  thresholds the cosine similarity between the embeddings of  $x$  and each pre-defined unacceptable concept to identify  $x^u$ . Rando et al. [36] design adversarial prompts ( $p^{adv}$ ) to evade  $F_{SD}$  by constructing  $p^{adv}$  to force a misclassification. We address this in ESPRESSO by configuring CLIP’s classification objective for fine-tuning to further improve robustness.

**Configuring CLIP’s Classification Objective.** Instead of using the cosine similarity to only  $c^u$  as in  $F_{SD}$ , we configure the objective function of ESPRESSO for filtering  $x^u$

by using the cosine similarity to *both*  $c^u$  and  $c^a$ . Further, jointly optimizing for two embeddings yields better utility as observed in prior fine-tuning CRTs [9, 22, 42]. Given  $x$ , ESPRESSO checks the cosine similarity of  $\phi_x(x)$  to  $\phi_p(c^u)$  and  $\phi_p(c^a)$ . Formally, we define ESPRESSO as  $F(x, c^u, c^a)$

$$= \operatorname{argmax}_{i, i \in \{a, u\}} \left\{ \frac{\exp(\cos(\phi_x(x), \phi_p(c_i))/\tau)}{\sum_{j \in \{a, u\}} \exp(\cos(\phi_x(x), \phi_p(c_j))/\tau)} \right\} \quad (1)$$

$\tau = \frac{1}{100}$  is the default temperature parameter used in CLIP.

**Fine-tuning.** The above configuration change lets us use fine-tuning to push acceptable and unacceptable concepts away from each other while maintaining their pairing with their corresponding image embeddings (for utility). Our fine-tuning objectives are inspired by the adversarial training literature which increase the distance of the training data records to the decision boundary to minimize the effect of adversarial examples [53]. We use two different fine-tuning variants depending on the group of concepts.

For concepts that have a strong correlation between  $\phi_p(p)$  and the corresponding  $\phi_x(x)$  (for example, where  $c^a$  is a broader category that includes  $c^u$ ;  $c^u = R2D2$  and  $c^a = robot$ ), we fine-tune  $F$  to increase the difference between  $\phi_p(p^u)$  and  $\phi_p(p^a)$ . We minimize the following:

$$L_{\text{ESPRESSO}} = -\|\overline{\phi_p(p^u)} - \overline{\phi_p(p^a)}\|_2 \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{\cdot}$  denotes normalization. For the case where  $c^u$  and  $c^a$  are opposites (e.g.,  $c^u = violence$  and  $c^a = peaceful$ ), the above objective function might have a low correlation between  $\phi_p(p)$  and the corresponding  $\phi_x(x)$ . This might result in poor utility. In this case, we use following objective function:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{ESPRESSO}} = & \alpha_{aa} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Con}}(\mathcal{D}_{aa}) - \alpha_{ua} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Con}}(\mathcal{D}_{ua}) \\ & + \alpha_{uu} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Con}}(\mathcal{D}_{uu}) - \alpha_{au} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Con}}(\mathcal{D}_{au}) \\ & - \alpha_{uu-t} \mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE}}(\phi_p(\mathcal{P}^u), \phi_p(\mathcal{P}^a)) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_{aa} = \{(x_j^a, p_j^a)\}_{j=1}^N$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{au} = \{(x_j^a, p_j^u)\}_{j=1}^N$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{ua} = \{(x_j^u, p_j^a)\}_{j=1}^N$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{uu} = \{(x_j^u, p_j^u)\}_{j=1}^N$ ,  $\mathcal{P}^u = \{p_j^u\}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}^a = \{p_j^a\}$ , and  $\alpha_{(\cdot)}$  are regularization hyperparameters. We assign equal weight to each of the loss terms, thus choosing  $\alpha_{(\cdot)} = 1$ . The above objective function encourages the CLIP embeddings of  $x^u$  and  $p^u$ , and  $x^a$  and  $p^a$ , to be closer together while increasing the distance between  $x^u$  and  $p^a$ , and  $x^a$  and  $p^u$ , respectively.

We use prompts ( $p^u$  and  $p^a$ ) for fine-tuning in Equation 2 and Equation 3 instead of only concepts ( $c^u$  and  $c^a$ ):  $p^u$  and  $p^a$  already contain  $c^u$  and  $c^a$ , and provide more context. During fine-tuning of ESPRESSO, there is a trade-off between **R1** and **R2** which is inherent to all other fine-tuning CRTs. We subject our fine-tuning to the constraint that achieved the highest effectiveness for the least drop in utility. We show the benefit of fine-tuning in Section 6.1.

## 5. Experimental Setup

We use SDv1.4 [37] and its default configuration as  $f$  following prior work [10, 13, 15, 19, 22, 51].

### 5.1. Revisiting Attack Baselines

We consider different state-of-art attacks from literature (Section 2.3). We modify existing naive attacks: RingBell, and PEZ, to account for CRTs (indicated with “+”). All CRTs use some variant of the following optimization: detach  $c^u$  from  $p$  such that the generated image is far from  $c^u$  and closer to some  $c^a$ . On the other hand, attacks against T2I models design  $p^{adv}$  such that  $x^{adv}$  is closer to  $c^u$  and far from  $c^a$ . Hence, to design an effective attack which accounts for such CRTs, in addition to the attacks’ original objectives, we minimize the loss between  $\phi_p(p^{adv})$  and  $\phi_p(c^a)$  while increasing the loss with  $\phi_p(c^u)$ . We modify the attacks to construct  $p^{adv}$  using following loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{att+} = \mathcal{L}_{att} - \alpha_u \mathcal{L}_{MSE}(\phi_p(c^u), \phi_p(p^{adv})) + \alpha_a \mathcal{L}_{MSE}(\phi_p(c^a), \phi_p(p^{adv})) \quad (4)$$

where  $att \in \{\text{RingBell}, \text{PEZ}\}$  when  $\text{CRT} \in \{\text{CA}, \text{FMN}, \text{SA}, \text{ESD}, \text{UCE}, \text{SDD}, \text{UD}, \text{ESPRESSO}\}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_{att}$  is the attack’s original objective. We assign equal weight to all loss terms and use  $\alpha_u = \alpha_a = 1$ . Recall from Section 2.3 that CCE already accounts for different fine-tuning CRTs. For filtering CRTs (UD and ESPRESSO), we modify CCE using Equation 4 and call it CCE+. Finally, typographic attack [30] against CLIP superimposes text characters onto an (unrelated) image to fool CLIP by forcing it to focus on the text instead of the image. We turn this into an attack against CRTs by superimposing  $c^a$  at the bottom of  $x^u$ . Using the resulting adversarial images, we use PEZ+ to find their corresponding  $p^{adv}$ . We call this attack `Typo+`.

### 5.2. Metrics

We use a *reference CLIP* (SDv1.4), separate from  $f$  with the CRTs, following prior work [10, 13, 19, 22].

**R1 (Effectiveness).** For fine-tuning CRTs, we use **CLIP accuracy** [16, 22] which is the cosine similarity between the embeddings of the generated image  $x$  with the embeddings of  $c^u$  and  $c^a$  from the reference CLIP. This outputs the likelihood of predicting  $c^u$ . Hence, CLIP accuracy should be low (ideally zero) for effective concept removal. Formally, it is:  $\frac{\exp(\cos(\tilde{\phi}_x(x), \tilde{\phi}_p(c^u)))}{\exp(\cos(\tilde{\phi}_x(x), \tilde{\phi}_p(c^u))) + \exp(\cos(\tilde{\phi}_x(x), \tilde{\phi}_p(c^a)))}$  where  $\tilde{\phi}_p$  and  $\tilde{\phi}_x$  are embeddings from the reference CLIP. For ESPRESSO, if  $x^u$  is detected, a replacement image is generated. Here, we calculate the CLIP accuracy on the final set of images after filtering.

For filtering CRTs, we use **false negative rates (FNR)** [36, 50] which is the fraction of images with  $c^u$  which are not blocked. It should be low (ideally zero).

**R2 (Utility).** For fine-tuning CRTs, we use **normalized CLIP score** which is the ratio of cosine similarity between  $\phi_x(x)$  and  $\phi_p(p)$  from  $f$ , compared to that from a reference CLIP as a baseline which is assumed to have the maximum achievable CLIP score. Formally,  $\frac{\cos(\phi_x(x), \phi_p(p))}{\cos(\tilde{\phi}_x(x), \tilde{\phi}_p(p))}$ . Normalized CLIP score should be high (ideally one) for high utility. This metric is different from standard CLIP score from prior work [13, 16, 19, 22] which only measures the cosine similarity between  $\phi_x(x)$  and  $\phi_p(p)$ . We modified it to compare the utility of the T2I with the CRT to that of the T2I without the CRT. Hence, a perfect match will give a score of one.

For filtering CRTs, we use **False Positive Rates (FPR)** [36, 50] which is the fraction of images without  $c^u$  which are blocked. It should be low (ideally zero).

**R3 (Robustness).** We use the same metrics as **R1**: CLIP accuracy for fine-tuning CRTs, and FNR for filtering CRTs.

### 5.3. Pipeline for Evaluating CRTs

We now describe the pipeline which includes identifying acceptable concepts (step 1), generation of datasets (step 2), training filters or fine-tuning T2I models with CRTs (step 3), validating acceptable concepts (step 4), and evaluating different CRTs (step 5). We present an overview of the pipeline in Figure 1 and describe each of the steps below.

**Concept Types.** We use the same  $c^u$  as prior work [19, 22, 31], categorizing them into three groups. Group-1 covers inappropriate concepts: *nudity*, *violence*, *disturbing*, and *hateful*. Group-2 covers copyright-infringing concepts: *Grumpy Cat*, *Nemo*, *Captain Marvel*, *Snoopy*, and *R2D2*. Group-3 covers unauthorized use of images: *Taylor Swift*, *Angelina Jolie*, *Brad Pitt*, and *Elon Musk*.

**Step 1: Identifying Acceptable Concepts** A good choice of  $c^a$  is one which effectively steers a T2I model away from generating  $x^u$  while maintaining utility on other concepts. Hence, the choice of  $c^a$  can impact **R1** and **R2**. We select  $c^a$  for a given  $c^u$  such that it is either opposite to  $c^u$  (Group-1) or is a semantic generalization of  $c^u$  so as to avoid infringing copyrights (Groups-2,3). For  $c^u$  in Group-1, we consider multiple alternative synonyms for  $c^a$ , from which we choose the best possible candidate by measuring effectiveness and utility on a validation dataset (see Step 4). For  $c^u$  in Groups-2,3, we use  $c^a$  from prior work for a fair comparison [15, 22]. We indicate them in the format “ $c^u \rightarrow c^a$ ”. For **Group-1**,  $c^a$  is the opposite of  $c^u$  and we consider the following choices of  $c^a$ : *nudity*  $\rightarrow$  {*clothed* and *clean*}; *violence*  $\rightarrow$  {*peaceful*, *nonviolent*, and *gentle*}; *disturbing*  $\rightarrow$  {*pleasing*, *calming*, and *soothing*}; *hateful*  $\rightarrow$  {*loving*, *compassionate*, and *kind*}. For **Group-2**:  $c^a$  is the broader category of  $c^u$ , following prior works [10, 15, 22]: *Grumpy Cat*  $\rightarrow$  *cat*, *Nemo*  $\rightarrow$  *fish*, *Captain Marvel*  $\rightarrow$  *female superhero*, *Snoopy*  $\rightarrow$  *dog*, and *R2D2*  $\rightarrow$  *robot*. For **Group-3**,  $c^a$  is the sex of  $c^u$ , following prior works [15, 19, 51]: {*Taylor Swift*, *Angelina Jolie*}  $\rightarrow$  *woman* and {*Brad Pitt*, *Elon Musk*}  $\rightarrow$




Figure 1. Overview of pipeline for evaluating CRTs. Prompts, images and arrows for unacceptable (acceptable) in red (green).

man. We compare ESPRESSO with each CRT category separately using concepts they were originally evaluated on: Group-1 for filtering CRTs [50]; all groups for fine-tuning CRTs [15, 19, 22, 51].

## Step 2: Generate and Split Datasets

**Train Datasets.** For *fine-tuning CRTs*, we use the exact same configuration as described in their original works. This configuration for a specific CRT is the same across different concepts. CA uses acceptable prompts which are generated from ChatGPT such that they contain  $c^a$ , and 1 image per prompt. ESD and SDD both use only  $c^u$ , and SDD additionally uses 10 images corresponding to  $c^u$ . All images are generated using SD v1.4. FMN uses unacceptable prompts of the form “An image of  $\{c^u\}$ ”, and 1 image per prompt. For all of them, we use their code for consistency with their original papers [11, 12, 14, 20, 23, 33, 52].

For *filtering CRTs*, we train  $F_{UD}$  using the original dataset configuration and code [50]. For ESPRESSO, we follow CA [22] to generate 10 unacceptable and acceptable prompts using ChatGPT, with one image per prompt from SDv1.4. For Group-2, we randomly select 10 ChatGPT-generated prompts from CA [22]. We use a small amount of training data following prior works which show little data is enough to modify CLIP [3, 47]. This is validated by our results (Section 6).

**Validation Datasets.** For validation datasets ( $D_{val}$ ), we denote the dataset with acceptable prompts ( $p^a$ ) and corresponding images ( $x^a$ ) as  $D_{val}^a$ ; and the dataset with unacceptable prompts ( $p^u$ ) and corresponding images ( $x^u$ ) as  $D_{val}^u$ . For **R1**, we use  $D_{val}^u$  by generating 10 unacceptable prompts using ChatGPT, and generate 5 images per prompt using SD v1.4. For **R2**, we use  $D_{val}^a$  by randomly choosing 100 acceptable prompts from the COCO 2014 dataset [26], and 1 image per prompt, from SD v1.4.

**Test Datasets.** For test dataset ( $D_{te}$ ), we denote the dataset with acceptable prompts ( $p^a$ ) and corresponding images ( $x^a$ ) as  $D_{te}^a$ ; and with unacceptable prompts ( $p^u$ ) and corre-

sponding images ( $x^u$ ) as  $D_{te}^u$ .

For evaluating effectiveness (**R1**), we use  $D_{te}^u$  which is generated as follows: For Group-1 concepts (*nude*, *violent*, *hateful*, or *disturbing*), we use Inappropriate Image Prompts (I2P), containing prompts which are likely to generate unsafe images [39]. We process I2P dataset following prior work [10, 13] to obtain 300 unacceptable prompts. UD [50] also used *political* as a concept, which is excluded from our evaluation since it is not a part of I2P. For concepts in Group-2,3, there are no standard benchmark datasets. Hence, we use the dataset from prior works [10, 22] with 200 unacceptable images generated from SDv1.4 from 10 unacceptable prompts generated from ChatGPT. For **R2**, we use the COCO 2014 test dataset as  $D_{te}^a$ , consistent with prior work, with 200 randomly chosen acceptable prompts, non-overlapping with  $D_{val}^a$ . For **R3**, we use  $D_{adv}^u$  by applying different attacks on  $D_{te}^u$  to generate adversarial prompts.

## Step 3: Fine-tuning with CRTs/training filter.

Using  $D_{tr}$ , we fine-tune T2I models using six fine-tuning CRTs described in Section 2.3. For filtering CRTs, we consider one baseline (UD) and do not compare with SD-Filter as UD outperforms it. We train UD’s classifier on their dataset and we fine-tune ESPRESSO on  $D_{tr}$  using Equation 2 for Groups-2,3 concepts and Equation 3 for Group-1 concepts. We use the CLIP L-patch-14 [17] due to its popularity, which is also the default encoder with SDv1.4. However, other variants of CLIP are also applicable.

**Step 4: Select best  $c^a$  using  $D_{val}$ .** For Group-1 concepts, we evaluate **R1** and **R2** for different candidates of  $c^a$  on  $D_{val}^u$  and  $D_{val}^a$  respectively. We found the concepts with the best results: *nudity*  $\rightarrow$  *clean*, *violence*  $\rightarrow$  *peaceful*, *disturbing*  $\rightarrow$  *pleasing*, and *hateful*  $\rightarrow$  *loving*. For *nudity*, we eliminated *clothed* as it blocked images with minimal exposed skin despite being acceptable [39, 50].

**Step 5: Evaluation.** We evaluate **R1** on  $D_{te}^u$ , **R2** on  $D_{te}^a$ , and **R3** on  $D_{adv}^u$ , which is generated by running different attacks on  $D_{te}^u$  to get  $p^{adv}$ . We pass the prompts from the

datasets to the T2I model and compute different metrics.

## 6. Evaluation

### 6.1. Impact of Fine-Tuning

We first empirically show how fine-tuning can improve the robustness similar to adversarial training in classifiers. Adversarial training [53] explicitly pushes the decision boundary away from training data records. Similarly, our fine-tuning objective, pushes the embeddings of acceptable and unacceptable concepts away from each other. This results in correctly classifying  $p_{adv}$  by ESPRESSO.

To demonstrate this, we generated 10 adversarial prompts, with 5 images per prompt using CCE+. We report the mean absolute difference between the cosine similarity of all the  $\phi_x(x^{adv})$  and  $\phi_p(c^u)$  and  $\phi_p(c^a)$  in Table 1. Across all concepts, using fine-tuning (w/ FT) makes  $\phi_x(x^{adv})$  closer to  $\phi_p(c^u)$  than  $\phi_p(c^a)$ , compared to the baseline without fine-tuning (w/o FT). Hence, fine-tuning is likely to correctly identify  $x^{adv}$  as  $x^u$ .

Table 1. Mean absolute difference between the cosine similarity of all the  $\phi_x(x^{adv})$  and  $\phi_p(c^u)$  and  $\phi_p(c^a)$ .

Concept	w/o FT	w/ FT
Nudity	10.28 ± 0.01	16.82 ± 0.03
Violence	4.45 ± 0.00	6.92 ± 0.01
Grumpy Cat	7.48 ± 0.00	8.77 ± 0.00
Nemo	3.88 ± 0.01	5.03 ± 0.01
Captain Marvel	5.46 ± 0.00	5.48 ± 0.01
Snoopy	9.12 ± 0.01	10.17 ± 0.02
R2D2	5.79 ± 0.00	8.35 ± 0.00
Taylor Swift	4.79 ± 0.01	4.87 ± 0.00
Angelina Jolie	5.54 ± 0.02	5.64 ± 0.00
Brad Pitt	6.81 ± 0.01	6.95 ± 0.00
Elon Musk	2.67 ± 0.01	2.71 ± 0.00

Furthermore, we evaluate the impact of fine-tuning on **R1** and **R2**. For **R1**, CLIP accuracy for several concepts is statistically better after fine-tuning: *Angelina Jolie* (0.03 ± 0.00 from 0.12 ± 0.02), *Brad Pitt* (0.00 ± 0.00 from 0.02 ± 0.01), *Elon Musk* (0.03 ± 0.00 from 0.07 ± 0.01). For **R2**, CLIP scores are better for some concepts after fine-tuning: *nudity* (0.94 ± 0.08 from 0.83 ± 0.07); *grumpy cat* (0.98 ± 0.04 from 0.88 ± 0.03), *Nemo* (0.37 ± 0.02 from 0.24 ± 0.05), *R2D2* (0.66 ± 0.02 from 0.52 ± 0.03), and *Elon musk* (0.92 ± 0.02 from 0.97 ± 0.01). The metrics for other concepts remains statistically similar.

### 6.2. Comparison with Fine-tuning CRTs

**R1 Effectiveness.** We report CLIP accuracy on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^u$  in Table 2. We use **red** if accuracy is >50; **blue** if accuracy is between 25-50; **green** if accuracy is <25. All CRTs exhibit poor accuracy on *nudity* and *violence*, likely due to fine-tuning CRTs being sensitive to input prompts [27, 32, 48]. Specifically, other CRTs depend on the  $c^u$  being included in prompts, which is absent for *nudity* and *violence* prompts in the I2P dataset. ESPRESSO consistently

maintains high accuracy on the I2P benchmark dataset as it classifies the generated images. ESD, and SDD have better accuracy compared to the other three fine-tuning CRTs. This could be attributed to their similar optimizations which includes fine-tuning  $\epsilon_\theta$ , conditioned on  $c^u$ , to match the unconditioned  $\epsilon_\theta$  to reduce the influence of  $c^u$  on the output. For UCE, we attribute the higher effectiveness to directly removing the influence of  $c^u$  from the T2I model parameters. **Overall, ESPRESSO is more effective than other fine-tuning CRTs.**

**R2 Utility.** We report normalized CLIP scores in Table 3 on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^a$ . We use **red** if score is between 50-70, **blue** if between 70-90; **green** if >90. All the fine-tuning CRTs perform well across all concepts (either **blue** or **green**) since they explicitly account for **R2**. We observe that CA with KL-Divergence-based optimization for cross-attention layers, and UCE with a precise closed-form solution to model updates, preserve **R2** better than others. ESPRESSO has high utility for all concepts except for *violence*, and Group-2 concepts (*Nemo*, *Captain Marvel*, *Snoopy*, and *R2D2*). During fine-tuning, there is a trade-off between **R1** and **R2**. For *violence*, we observed an early decrease in utility during the very first epoch resulting in poor trade-off. For Group-2 concepts, we attribute the poor utility to the ambiguity in the unacceptable concepts. For instance, *Nemo* is both a fish and a ship captain [44], and *Captain Marvel* represents both a male and a female superhero [7]. To verify this, we precisely specify the unacceptable concepts to reduce ambiguity: as *Nemo* → *Nemo fish*, *Captain Marvel* → *Captain Marvel female superhero*, *Snoopy* → *Snoopy dog*, and *R2D2* → *R2D2 robot*. We evaluate ESPRESSO on  $\mathcal{D}_{val}^a$ : compared to the results in Table 3, the normalized CLIP score for this new configuration is: 0.97 ± 0.00 (*Nemo fish*), 0.90 ± 0.02 (*Captain Marvel female superhero*), 0.98 ± 0.03 (*Snoopy dog*), 0.92 ± 0.02 (*R2D2 robot*), which are now labeled as **green**. We also evaluate effectiveness (**R1**) and find that the CLIP accuracy is similar to Table 2. **Overall, ESPRESSO’s utility (R2) is comparable to prior works.**

**R3 Robustness.** We report CLIP accuracy on  $\mathcal{D}_{adv}^u$  in Table 4. We evaluate different CRTs against Typo+, PEZ+, CCE/CCE+, and RingBell+. We use the same color coding as in **R1**. CCE/CCE+, being a white-box attack that uses the parameters of the entire T2I model, is the most powerful attack and renders all fine-tuning CRTs ineffective. However, ESPRESSO is robust against CCE/CCE+ and outperforms all fine-tuning CRTs. On the remaining attacks, all the fine-tuning CRTs have better robustness on Group-3 concepts than on Group-1 and 2. We attribute this to the difficulty of T2I models in generating high quality celebrity faces while also evading detection, as also observed in prior work [29]. As expected, we note that all CRTs perform poorly on *nudity* and *violence* across all the attacks as they

Table 2. **R1 Effectiveness:** Comparison with fine-tuning CRTs using CLIP accuracy on *acceptable* prompts in  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^u$  (lower is better).

CRT	Concepts										
	Nudity (I2P)	Violence (I2P)	Grumpy Cat	Nemo	Captain Marvel	Snoopy	R2D2	Taylor Swift	Angelina Jolie	Brad Pitt	Elon Musk
CA [22]	0.82 ± 0.01	0.78 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.00	0.40 ± 0.05	0.06 ± 0.05	0.13 ± 0.02	0.73 ± 0.05	0.83 ± 0.02	0.86 ± 0.04	0.64 ± 0.03
FMN [51]	0.83 ± 0.01	0.64 ± 0.04	0.34 ± 0.02	0.61 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.03	0.16 ± 0.00	0.89 ± 0.03	0.45 ± 0.02	0.59 ± 0.06	0.79 ± 0.04	0.56 ± 0.22
SA [15]	0.69 ± 0.09	0.69 ± 0.00	0.16 ± 0.00	0.87 ± 0.04	0.93 ± 0.02	0.55 ± 0.07	0.98 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.05	0.49 ± 0.04	0.63 ± 0.05	0.75 ± 0.04
ESD [10]	0.62 ± 0.06	0.63 ± 0.01	0.28 ± 0.06	0.64 ± 0.06	0.37 ± 0.04	0.20 ± 0.02	0.41 ± 0.04	0.11 ± 0.02	0.29 ± 0.05	0.17 ± 0.02	0.17 ± 0.02
UCE [13]	0.70 ± 0.01	0.71 ± 0.01	0.05 ± 0.00	0.43 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00	0.40 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	0.10 ± 0.01
SDD [19]	0.57 ± 0.02	0.55 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.03	0.41 ± 0.03	0.37 ± 0.03	0.39 ± 0.02	0.05 ± 0.02	0.06 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.01
ESPRESSO	0.15 ± 0.06	0.20 ± 0.05	0.00 ± 0.01	0.10 ± 0.02	0.03 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.00

Table 3. **R2 (Utility):** Comparison with fine-tuning CRTs using normalized CLIP scores on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^a$  (higher is better). **Note:** ESPRESSO’s utility against Group-2 concepts like *Nemo*, *Captain Marvel*, *Snoopy*, and *R2D2* can be improved as described in Section 6.2.

CRT	Concepts										
	Nudity	Violence	Grumpy Cat	Nemo	Captain Marvel	Snoopy	R2D2	Taylor Swift	Angelina Jolie	Brad Pitt	Elon Musk
CA [22]	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00
FMN [51]	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00
SA [15]	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.00	0.79 ± 0.01	0.79 ± 0.00
ESD [10]	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.01	0.82 ± 0.01
UCE [13]	0.96 ± 0.02	0.96 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.03	0.96 ± 0.00	0.96 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.02	0.96 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.02	0.97 ± 0.01	0.96 ± 0.03	0.97 ± 0.00
SDD [19]	0.86 ± 0.00	0.75 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.00	0.86 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.00	0.64 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.00	0.61 ± 0.00	0.89 ± 0.00
ESPRESSO	0.94 ± 0.08	0.59 ± 0.11	0.98 ± 0.04	0.37 ± 0.02	0.37 ± 0.03	0.66 ± 0.03	0.66 ± 0.02	0.98 ± 0.02	0.98 ± 0.03	0.98 ± 0.01	0.97 ± 0.01

Table 4. **R3 (Robustness):** Comparison with fine-tuning CRTs using CLIP accuracy on *adversarial* prompts in  $\mathcal{D}_{adv}^u$  (lower is better). We evaluate fine-tuning CRT’s against CCE and ESPRESSO against CCE + since CCE is already adapted to fine-tuning CRT’s.

CRT	Concepts										
	Nudity (I2P)	Violence (I2P)	Grumpy Cat	Nemo	Captain Marvel	Snoopy	R2D2	Taylor Swift	Angelina Jolie	Brad Pitt	Elon Musk
Typo +											
CA [22]	0.58 ± 0.02	0.75 ± 0.01	0.26 ± 0.02	0.27 ± 0.01	0.42 ± 0.01	0.29 ± 0.02	0.23 ± 0.02	0.09 ± 0.02	0.24 ± 0.01	0.05 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.06
FMN [51]	0.61 ± 0.02	0.75 ± 0.02	0.21 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.01	0.49 ± 0.02	0.27 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.02	0.03 ± 0.01	0.17 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.01	0.34 ± 0.01
SA [15]	0.31 ± 0.01	0.71 ± 0.02	0.99 ± 0.01	0.94 ± 0.01	0.89 ± 0.02	0.73 ± 0.03	0.99 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.02	0.05 ± 0.01	0.43 ± 0.04	0.65 ± 0.05
ESD [10]	0.39 ± 0.01	0.70 ± 0.01	0.27 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.05	0.40 ± 0.03	0.23 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.05	0.03 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.07	0.04 ± 0.03	0.23 ± 0.05
UCE [13]	0.41 ± 0.00	0.60 ± 0.00	0.28 ± 0.02	0.29 ± 0.02	0.34 ± 0.02	0.21 ± 0.03	0.17 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.00	0.12 ± 0.00
SDD [19]	0.20 ± 0.02	0.50 ± 0.04	0.27 ± 0.02	0.21 ± 0.02	0.48 ± 0.01	0.19 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.00	0.05 ± 0.00	0.10 ± 0.01
ESPRESSO	0.14 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.01	0.10 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.01	0.09 ± 0.01	0.09 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.01	0.01 ± 0.01	0.01 ± 0.01
PEZ +											
CA [22]	0.75 ± 0.01	0.84 ± 0.02	0.33 ± 0.04	0.52 ± 0.01	0.70 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.01	0.25 ± 0.03	0.46 ± 0.01	0.64 ± 0.01	0.63 ± 0.02	0.72 ± 0.01
FMN [51]	0.74 ± 0.01	0.72 ± 0.02	0.43 ± 0.02	0.41 ± 0.01	0.85 ± 0.03	0.45 ± 0.01	0.93 ± 0.06	0.04 ± 0.01	0.16 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.01	0.23 ± 0.01
SA [15]	0.55 ± 0.03	0.82 ± 0.01	0.14 ± 0.00	0.14 ± 0.00	0.14 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.00	0.15 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.01	0.14 ± 0.00	0.15 ± 0.01
ESD [10]	0.69 ± 0.01	0.88 ± 0.01	0.36 ± 0.06	0.40 ± 0.04	0.44 ± 0.02	0.34 ± 0.03	0.26 ± 0.03	0.05 ± 0.02	0.11 ± 0.04	0.17 ± 0.02	0.23 ± 0.03
UCE [13]	0.59 ± 0.00	0.82 ± 0.00	0.23 ± 0.01	0.52 ± 0.01	0.59 ± 0.03	0.14 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.02
SDD [19]	0.30 ± 0.01	0.60 ± 0.01	0.28 ± 0.05	0.28 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.03	0.34 ± 0.03	0.30 ± 0.03	0.04 ± 0.01	0.09 ± 0.02	0.06 ± 0.01	0.12 ± 0.01
ESPRESSO	0.15 ± 0.01	0.25 ± 0.05	0.10 ± 0.01	0.12 ± 0.01	0.11 ± 0.03	0.08 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00	0.04 ± 0.00
RingBell +											
CA [22]	0.97 ± 0.01	0.96 ± 0.01	0.79 ± 0.01	0.76 ± 0.02	0.88 ± 0.02	0.38 ± 0.02	0.65 ± 0.05	0.03 ± 0.03	0.00 ± 0.01	0.88 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.01
FMN [51]	0.96 ± 0.01	0.95 ± 0.02	0.75 ± 0.00	0.57 ± 0.01	0.91 ± 0.00	0.45 ± 0.01	0.59 ± 0.01	0.26 ± 0.01	0.85 ± 0.02	0.88 ± 0.01	0.99 ± 0.02
SA [15]	0.80 ± 0.02	0.98 ± 0.02	0.93 ± 0.02	0.98 ± 0.01	0.96 ± 0.03	0.97 ± 0.03	0.88 ± 0.02	0.00 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.02	0.77 ± 0.10	1.00 ± 0.01
ESD [10]	0.77 ± 0.03	0.95 ± 0.02	0.63 ± 0.06	0.66 ± 0.12	0.56 ± 0.06	0.66 ± 0.07	0.69 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.00	0.03 ± 0.02	0.27 ± 0.03	0.55 ± 0.08
UCE [13]	0.84 ± 0.00	0.67 ± 0.00	0.38 ± 0.05	0.74 ± 0.01	0.07 ± 0.00	0.16 ± 0.01	0.50 ± 0.01	0.05 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.01	0.34 ± 0.01
SDD [19]	0.33 ± 0.02	0.60 ± 0.03	0.22 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.01	0.62 ± 0.01	0.42 ± 0.03	0.41 ± 0.01	0.07 ± 0.02	0.07 ± 0.02	0.07 ± 0.01	0.17 ± 0.02
ESPRESSO	0.05 ± 0.01	0.08 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.08	0.15 ± 0.03	0.04 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.05	0.00 ± 0.02	0.03 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.02
CCE or CCE + (against ESPRESSO)											
CA [22]	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.80 ± 0.00
FMN [51]	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.98 ± 0.00	0.98 ± 0.01	0.99 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00
SA [15]	0.98 ± 0.01	0.99 ± 0.01	0.99 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.84 ± 0.01	0.97 ± 0.00	0.81 ± 0.01
ESD [10]	0.92 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.91 ± 0.01	0.94 ± 0.00	0.96 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.98 ± 0.01
UCE [13]	1.00 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.98 ± 0.00	0.98 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.99 ± 0.00	0.63 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.00	0.77 ± 0.01
SDD [19]	1.00 ± 0.00	0.81 ± 0.00	0.81 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.01	0.96 ± 0.00	0.98 ± 0.00	0.97 ± 0.01	0.67 ± 0.01	0.77 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.00	0.81 ± 0.01
ESPRESSO	0.00 ± 0.00	0.40 ± 0.05	0.02 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.01	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.01

do not satisfy **R1**. Overall, ESPRESSO is more robust than all prior work across all the concepts and attacks.

### 6.3. Comparison with Filtering CRT

**R1 Effectiveness.** We report FNR across four concepts (*nudity*, *violence*, *disturbing*, and *hateful*) in Table 5. We use red if FNR is >0.50; blue if FNR is between 0.25-0.50; green if FNR is <0.25. ESPRESSO has better FNR for

three of the four concepts: *nudity*, *violence* (in green), and *hateful* (blue for ESPRESSO and red for UD). However, both ESPRESSO and UD perform poorly on *disturbing*. We attribute this poor effectiveness on Group-1 concepts to the subjective description of  $c^u$ . Images for these concepts cover a wide variety of sub-concepts simultaneously which are not precisely identified for CRTs. **Overall, ESPRESSO is more effective than UD on most concepts.**

Table 5. **R1** (Effectiveness): Comparison with UD using FNR on unacceptable prompts in  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^u$  (lower is better).

Concepts	UD	ESPRESSO
Nudity (I2P)	0.39 ± 0.02	0.14 ± 0.05
Violence (I2P)	0.90 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.00
Disturbing (I2P)	0.89 ± 0.03	0.53 ± 0.08
Hateful (I2P)	1.00 ± 0.00	0.42 ± 0.03

**R2 Utility.** We present FPR in Table 6 and use red if FPR is >0.50, blue if FPR is between 0.25-0.50; green if FPR is <0.25. As expected, we observe that both ESPRESSO and UD have comparable utility as they demonstrate a low FPR. UD explicitly includes images containing  $c^a$  while training the multi-headed classifier.

Table 6. **R2** (Utility): Comparison with UD using FPR on acceptable prompts in  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^a$  (lower is better).

Concepts	UD	ESPRESSO
Nudity (I2P)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.01
Violence (I2P)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.08 ± 0.05
Disturbing (I2P)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.01
Hateful (I2P)	0.01 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.04

**R3 Robustness.** We report FNR on the dataset for adversarial prompts and corresponding images in Table 7. We use the same color-coding as R1. In addition to the four attacks from Table 4, recall that SneakyPrompt [49] is specifically designed to attack filtering CRTs. Hence, we also include the evaluation against SneakyPrompt. Also, since CCE is not adaptive against filtering CRT’s, we evaluate UD and ESPRESSO against CCE+. We are the first to evaluate different attacks against UD. We observe that ESPRESSO

Table 7. **R3** (Robustness): Comparison with UD using FNR on adversarial prompts in  $\mathcal{D}_{adv}^u$  (lower is better).

CRT	Nudity	Violence	Disturbing	Hateful
<b>Typo+</b>				
UD	0.55 ± 0.02	0.91 ± 0.05	0.39 ± 0.01	0.48 ± 0.01
ESPRESSO	0.15 ± 0.01	0.26 ± 0.01	0.39 ± 0.01	0.37 ± 0.05
<b>PEZ+</b>				
UD	0.65 ± 0.02	0.91 ± 0.02	0.89 ± 0.02	1.00 ± 0.00
ESPRESSO	0.16 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.04	0.14 ± 0.03	0.20 ± 0.05
<b>CCE</b>				
UD	0.00 ± 0.00	0.75 ± 0.05	1.00 ± 0.05	1.00 ± 0.00
ESPRESSO	0.00 ± 0.00	0.38 ± 0.05	0.02 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.01
<b>RingBell+</b>				
UD	0.95 ± 0.03	0.50 ± 0.04	0.30 ± 0.05	0.90 ± 0.05
ESPRESSO	0.06 ± 0.08	0.08 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.05
<b>SneakyPrompt</b>				
UD	0.67 ± 0.21	0.71 ± 0.02	0.82 ± 0.03	0.48 ± 0.06
ESPRESSO	0.40 ± 0.08	0.14 ± 0.03	0.70 ± 0.05	0.15 ± 0.10

is effective against PEZ+ while UD can be evaded. On all

the remaining attacks, we show that ESPRESSO is robust on more concepts than UD. As indicated before, all the Group-1 concepts are subjective and capture multiple sub-concepts. This ambiguity could be the reason for poor R3. **Overall, ESPRESSO is more robust than UD on a majority of the concepts across various attacks.**

### 6.4. Summary




Figure 2. ESPRESSO has better trade-offs than other CRTs

We depict the trade-offs among R1, R2, and R3 in Figure 2 across various CRTs. For fine-tuning CRTs, we use (1-CLIP accuracy) for R1 on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^u$ , normalized CLIP score on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^a$  for R2, and (1-CLIP accuracy) for R3 on  $\mathcal{D}_{adv}^u$  using CCE/CCE+ (the strongest attack among others). For filtering CRT, we use (1- FNR) on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^u$  for R1, (1- FPR) on  $\mathcal{D}_{te}^a$  for R2, and (1- FNR) on  $\mathcal{D}_{adv}^u$  using CCE+ for R3. For each of the requirements, we use the average across all concepts as the representative value for a CRT. **Overall, ESPRESSO provides a better trade-off across the three requirements compared to all the prior work.**

### 7. Discussion and Future Work

**Filtering Multiple Concepts.** UCE [13] removes multiple concepts simultaneously. ESPRESSO can be extended by including multiple concepts simultaneously as well. Specifically, for ESPRESSO in Equation 1, instead of specifying  $c^u$  and  $c^a$  for a single concept, we can include  $c^u$  and  $c^a$  for multiple concepts as a list. This is a simple configuration change compared to other filters which require retraining (e.g., [50]). We leave the evaluation as future work.

**Applicability to other T2I Models.** Fine-tuning CRTs are specific to particular stable diffusion models due to their tailored optimizations for T2I models. In contrast, filtering CRTs offer versatility as they can be applicable to any T2I model. Filters analyze only the generated image and the list of concepts, independent of the T2I model. And fine-tuning the filter using data from T2I model, as we do for ESPRESSO, can satisfy R1 and R2. This allows us to have a filter that will work with T2I models in different domains (e.g., anime images). Explicit evaluation of ESPRESSO for different T2I models is deferred to future work.



## Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by Intel (in the context of Private AI consortium), and the Government of Ontario. Views expressed in the paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the funding agencies.

## References

- [1] Zhongjie Ba, Jieming Zhong, Jiachen Lei, Peng Cheng, Qinglong Wang, Zhan Qin, Zhibo Wang, and Kui Ren. Surrogateprompt: Bypassing the safety filter of text-to-image models via substitution. In *arXiv:2309.14122*, 2023. 2
- [2] Nicholas Carlini, Jamie Hayes, Milad Nasr, Matthew Jagielski, Vikash Sehwal, Florian Tramèr, Borja Balle, Daphne Ippolito, and Eric Wallace. Extracting training data from diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd USENIX Conference on Security Symposium, SEC '23, USA, 2023*. USENIX Association. 1
- [3] Nicholas Carlini and Andreas Terzis. Poisoning and backdooring contrastive learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 5
- [4] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Krishnamurthy Dj Dvijotham, Leslie Rice, Mingjie Sun, and J Zico Kolter. (certified!!) adversarial robustness for free! In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 11
- [5] Huanran Chen, Yinpeng Dong, Shitong Shao, Zhongkai Hao, Xiao Yang, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. Your diffusion model is secretly a certifiably robust classifier. In *arXiv:2402.02316*, 2024. 13
- [6] Jeremy Cohen, Elan Rosenfeld, and Zico Kolter. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1310–1320. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. 11, 12
- [7] Will Friedwald. Captain marvel vs. captain marvel: The strange tale of two dueling superheroes, Mar 2019. 6
- [8] Rinon Gal, Yuval Alaluf, Yuval Atzmon, Or Patashnik, Amit Haim Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 2
- [9] Rinon Gal, Or Patashnik, Haggai Maron, Amit H. Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Stylegan-nada: Clip-guided domain adaptation of image generators. volume 41, New York, NY, USA, jul 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. 3
- [10] Rohit Gandikota, Joanna Materzynska, Jaden Fiotto-Kaufman, and David Bau. Erasing concepts from diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2426–2436, October 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14
- [11] Rohit Gandikota, Joanna Materzyńska, Jaden Fiotto-Kaufman, and David Bau. GitHub - Erasing Concepts from Diffusion Models. <https://github.com/rohitgandikota/erasing>, 2023. 5
- [12] Rohit Gandikota, Hadas Orgad, Yonatan Belinkov, Joanna Materzyńska, and David Bau. GitHub - Unified Concept Editing in Diffusion Models. <https://github.com/rohitgandikota/unified-concept-editing/tree/main>, 2023. 5
- [13] Rohit Gandikota, Hadas Orgad, Yonatan Belinkov, Joanna Materzyńska, and David Bau. Unified concept editing in diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 5111–5120, January 2024. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14
- [14] Alvin Heng and Harold Soh. GitHub - selective-amnesia. <https://github.com/clear-nus/selective-amnesia/tree/main>, 2023. 5
- [15] Alvin Heng and Harold Soh. Selective amnesia: A continual learning approach to forgetting in deep generative models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14
- [16] Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. CLIPScore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7514–7528, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, Nov. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. 4
- [17] HuggingFace. openai/clip-vit-large-patch14 · hugging face, 2021. 5
- [18] Gwanghyun Kim, Taesung Kwon, and Jong Chul Ye. Diffusionclip: Text-guided diffusion models for robust image manipulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2426–2435, June 2022. 13
- [19] Sanghyun Kim, Seohyeon Jung, Balhae Kim, Moonseok Choi, Jinwoo Shin, and Juho Lee. Towards safe self-distillation of internet-scale text-to-image diffusion models. In *ICML 2023 Workshop on Challenges in Deployable Generative AI*, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14
- [20] Sanghyun Kim, Seohyeon Jung, Balhae Kim, Moonseok Choi, Jinwoo Shin, and Juho Lee. GitHub - safe-diffusion. <https://github.com/nannulna/safe-diffusion>, 2024. 5
- [21] Jennifer Korn. Getty images suing the makers of popular ai art tool for allegedly stealing photos. In *CNN Business*. CNN, Jan 2023. 1
- [22] Nupur Kumari, Bingliang Zhang, Sheng-Yu Wang, Eli Shechtman, Richard Zhang, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Ablating concepts in text-to-image diffusion models. In *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14
- [23] Nupur Kumari, Bingliang Zhang, Sheng-Yu Wang, Eli Shechtman, Richard Zhang, and Jun-Yan Zhu. GitHub: Ablating Concepts in Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. <https://github.com/nupurkmr9/concept-ablation>, 2023. 5
- [24] Seung Hyun Lee, Wonseok Roh, Wonmin Byeon, Sang Ho Yoon, Chanyoung Kim, Jinkyu Kim, and Sangpil Kim.

- Sound-guided semantic image manipulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3377–3386, June 2022. 2
- [25] Xinfeng Li, Yuchen Yang, Jiangyi Deng, Chen Yan, Yanjiao Chen, Xiaoyu Ji, and Wenyan Xu. Safegen: Mitigating unsafe content generation in text-to-image models. In *arXiv:2404.06666*, 2024. 1, 3
- [26] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, Lubomir D. Bourdev, Ross B. Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft COCO: common objects in context. *CoRR*, abs/1405.0312, 2014. 5
- [27] Jiachen Ma, Anda Cao, Zhiqing Xiao, Jie Zhang, Chao Ye, and Junbo Zhao. Jailbreaking prompt attack: A controllable adversarial attack against diffusion models. In *arXiv:2404.02928*, 2024. 6
- [28] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018. 13
- [29] Meg Matthias. Why does ai art screw up hands and fingers?, Aug 2023. 6
- [30] David A. Noever and Samantha E. Miller Noever. Reading isn't believing: Adversarial attacks on multi-modal neurons. In *arXiv:2103.10480*, 2021. 4
- [31] Minh Pham, Kelly O. Marshall, Niv Cohen, Govind Mittal, and Chinmay Hegde. Circumventing concept erasure methods for text-to-image generative models. In *International Conference on Learning Representation*, 2024. 1, 2, 4
- [32] Minh Pham, Kelly O. Marshall, Chinmay Hegde, and Niv Cohen. Robust concept erasure using task vectors. In *arXiv:2404.03631*, 2024. 6
- [33] Yiting Qu, Xinyue Shen, Xinlei He, Michael Backes, Savvas Zannettou, and Yang Zhang. GitHub: unsafe-diffusion. <https://github.com/YitingQu/unsafe-diffusion/tree/main>, 2023. 5
- [34] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1, 2, 3
- [35] Aditya Ramesh, Rishabh Goyal, Alessandro Sordani, Yaniv Ovadia, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Dall-e 2: The flower that blooms in adversity. In *OpenAI Blog*, October 2021. 1
- [36] Javier Rando, Daniel Paleka, David Lindner, Lennart Heim, and Florian Tramèr. Red-teaming the stable diffusion safety filter. In *arXiv:2210.04610*, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 4
- [37] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10684–10695, June 2022. 1, 3, 4
- [38] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10684–10695, June 2022. 1
- [39] Patrick Schramowski, Manuel Brack, Björn Deiseroth, and Kristian Kersting. Safe latent diffusion: Mitigating inappropriate degeneration in diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023. 1, 2, 5
- [40] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade W Gordon, Ross Wightman, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa R Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, pages 1–2, 2022. 1
- [41] G. Somepalli, V. Singla, M. Goldblum, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein. Diffusion art or digital forgery? investigating data replication in diffusion models. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6048–6058, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, jun 2023. IEEE Computer Society. 1
- [42] Yu-Lin Tsai, Chia-Yi Hsu, Chulin Xie, Chih-Hsun Lin, Jia-You Chen, Bo Li, Pin-Yu Chen, Chia-Mu Yu, and Chun-Ying Huang. Ring-a-bell! how reliable are concept removal methods for diffusion models? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [43] Aäron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. In *arXiv:1807.03748*, volume abs/1807.03748, 2018. 2
- [44] Jules Verne. *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the sea*. Aladin Books, 2024. 6
- [45] Yuxin Wen, Neel Jain, John Kirchenbauer, Micah Goldblum, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 1, 2, 13
- [46] Chaowei Xiao, Zhongzhu Chen, Kun Jin, Jiong Xiao Wang, Weili Nie, Mingyan Liu, Anima Anandkumar, Bo Li, and Dawn Song. Densepure: Understanding diffusion models towards adversarial robustness. In *arXiv:2211.00322*, 2022. 13
- [47] Wenhan Yang, Jingdong Gao, and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. Robust contrastive language-image pretraining against data poisoning and backdoor attacks. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 2, 5
- [48] Yijun Yang, Ruiyuan Gao, Xiao Yang, Jianyuan Zhong, and Qiang Xu. Guard2i: Defending text-to-image models from adversarial prompts. In *arXiv:2403.01446*, 2024. 6
- [49] Yuchen Yang, Bo Hui, Haolin Yuan, Neil Gong, and Yinzhi Cao. Sneakyprompt: Jailbreaking text-to-image generative

models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2024. 1, 2, 8

- [50] Qu Yiting, Shen Xinyue, He Xinlei, Backes Michael, Zannettou Savvas, and Zhang Yang. Unsafe diffusion: On the generation of unsafe images and hateful memes from text-to-image models. In *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*. ACM, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 14
- [51] Eric Zhang, Kai Wang, Xingqian Xu, Zhangyang Wang, and Humphrey Shi. Forget-me-not: Learning to forget in text-to-image diffusion models. In *arXiv:2211.08332*, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14
- [52] Eric Zhang, Kai Wang, Xingqian Xu, Zhangyang Wang, and Humphrey Shi. GitHub - Forget-Me-Not. <https://github.com/SHI-Labs/Forget-Me-Not>, 2023. 5
- [53] Hongyang Zhang, Yaodong Yu, Jiantao Jiao, Eric Xing, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Michael Jordan. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 7472–7482. PMLR, 2019. 3, 6
- [54] Jiawei Zhang, Zhongzhu Chen, Huan Zhang, Chaowei Xiao, and Bo Li. {DiffSmooth}: Certifiably robust learning via diffusion models and local smoothing. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*, pages 4787–4804, 2023. 13

We present theoretical robustness bounds to certify robustness of ESPRESSO along with empirical analysis (Section A) followed by the efficiency of various CRTs (Section B).

## A. Certifying Robustness of ESPRESSO

Inspired by the literature on certified robustness against adversarial examples [6], it is natural to ask whether a similar notion of certified robustness is possible for CRTs. None of the existing CRTs have considered certified robustness. To this end, we are the first to explore its feasibility for ESPRESSO. We first present a theoretical bound on the worst-case modification by  $Adv$  under which we can guarantee ESPRESSO’s accuracy (Section A.1). We then empirically evaluate this bound on different concepts (Section A.2) and discuss some implications (Section A.3).

### A.1. Theoretical Bound

Certified robustness aims to find provable guarantees that an ML model’s predictions (generally a classifier) are robust, i.e., the predictions do not change on adding noise to the input [4]. Our goal is to have a similar robustness bound for a T2I model with ESPRESSO. We want to find the maximum input noise which ESPRESSO can tolerate.

We give advantage to  $Adv$  by assuming they can directly add adversarial noise to ESPRESSO’s embeddings. This is a strong assumption as in practice,  $Adv$  can only send prompts to the T2I model. We revisit this assumption

later in Section A.3. Formally, given an unacceptable image  $x^u$ ,  $Adv$  adds noise  $\delta$  to its embeddings,  $\phi_x(x^u)$ , such that  $F(\phi_x(x^u) + \delta)$  is misclassified as acceptable. Using this assumption, we specify the maximum noise  $\delta$  added to the embeddings,  $\phi_x(x^u)$ , that ESPRESSO can tolerate in Theorem 1.




Figure 3. Certified accuracy of ESPRESSO vs. adversarial noise  $\delta$ , for a strong  $Adv$  with access to embeddings of generated images.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\hat{x} = \phi_x(x)$ ,  $\hat{c}^i = \phi_p(c^i)$ ,  $i \in \{a, u\}$ . Define

$$g_i(\hat{x}) := \frac{\exp(s(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^i))}{\exp(s(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^a)) + \exp(s(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^u))},$$

where  $s(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^i) = \tau \cos(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^i)$ , then  $g_i$  is the confidence of  $\hat{x}$  being classified as  $c^i$ .  $F(x)$  can be defined as  $F(\hat{x}) = \text{argmax}_i g_i(\hat{x})$ , and  $F(\hat{x})$  classifies  $\hat{x}$  as unacceptable if  $g_u(\hat{x}) > \Gamma$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the decision threshold. For a given image embedding  $\hat{x}$ , if  $g(\hat{x}) := g_u(\hat{x}) > \Gamma$ , then  $g$  is robust against noise  $\delta$  where

$$\|\delta\| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{\tau + 2|g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma|}\right) \|\hat{x}\|,$$

and  $\Gamma$  is the decision threshold i.e.

$$F(\hat{x}) = F(\hat{x} + \delta), \forall \|\delta\| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{\tau + 2|g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma|}\right) \|\hat{x}\|. \quad (5)$$

*Proof Sketch.* We prove the above theorem by applying Lipschitz continuity over  $g(\hat{x})$ .  $F(\cdot)$  is the composition of the softmax function and the scaled cosine similarity over the

embeddings, where both functions are Lipschitz continuous when  $\|\hat{x}\| > 0$ . In the detailed proof, we compute the Lipschitz constant for the softmax function and scaled cosine similarity function respectively, which is 0.25 and  $\frac{\tau}{\|\hat{x}\|}$ . Then the Lipschitz constant for  $g(\hat{x})$  will be  $\frac{\tau}{2\|\hat{x}\|}$  according to the chain rule. Finally, using the triangle inequality on  $|g(\hat{x}) - g(\hat{x} + \delta)|$ , and plugging the bound in to the inequality, we get  $g(\hat{x} + \delta) \geq \Gamma$ .

*Proof.* For an unacceptable image embedding  $\hat{x} = \phi_x(x^u)$ ,  $g(\hat{x}) := g_u(\hat{x})$ , then  $g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma > 0$ , and  $\Gamma$  is the decision threshold for classification. Let  $s_1 = \tau \cos(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^u)$ ,  $s_2 = \tau \cos(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^a)$ ,  $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, s_2]^T$ , then

$$g(\hat{x}) = S(s_1) = \frac{\exp(s_1)}{\exp(s_1) + \exp(s_2)},$$

where  $S(s_1)$  is the first item of Softmax function with respect to  $\mathbf{s}$ . Then, we have  $\frac{\partial}{\partial s_1} S = S(s_1)(1 - S(s_1)) \leq 0.25$ ,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial s_2} S = -S(s_1)S(s_2) \leq 0.25$ .

Note that  $\|\hat{x}\| > 0$  and  $\|\hat{c}^a\| > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{x}} s(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^a) \right\| &= \left\| \frac{\tau \|\hat{c}^a\| (I - xx^T) \hat{c}^a}{\|\hat{x}\| \|\hat{c}^a\|^2} \right\| \\ &= \frac{\tau \sin(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^a)}{\|\hat{x}\|} \leq \frac{\tau}{\|\hat{x}\|}. \end{aligned}$$

And  $\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{x}} s(\hat{x}, \hat{c}^u) \right\| \leq \frac{\tau}{\|\hat{x}\|}$ .

For each  $\hat{x}$ , according to the chain rule of composition functions,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{x}} g(\hat{x}) = \frac{\partial S}{\partial s_1} \cdot \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial \hat{x}} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial s_2} \cdot \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial \hat{x}} \leq \frac{\tau}{2\|\hat{x}\|}$ . Therefore the Lipschitz constant of  $g(\hat{x})$  with respect to  $\hat{x}$  is  $\frac{\tau}{2\|\hat{x}\|}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(\hat{x} + \delta) - g(\hat{x})\| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\tau}{\min\{\|u\| \mid u \in U(\hat{x}, \delta)\}} \|\delta\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\tau}{\|\hat{x}\| - \|\delta\|} \|\delta\|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $U(\hat{x}, \delta)$  is a  $l_2$ -ball of  $\hat{x}$  with radius  $\delta$ .

When  $\|\delta\| \leq (1 - \frac{\tau}{\tau + 2|g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma|}) \|\hat{x}\| < \|\hat{x}\|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g(\hat{x} + \delta) - g(\hat{x})| &= |g(\hat{x} + \delta) - g(\hat{x})| \\ &\leq \frac{\tau}{2 \left( \frac{\|\hat{x}\|}{\|\delta\|} - 1 \right)} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau}{2 \left( \frac{\tau + 2|g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma|}{2|g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma|} - 1 \right)} \\ &\leq |g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma| = g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\hat{x} + \delta) &\geq |g(\hat{x})| - |g(\hat{x} + \delta) - g(\hat{x})| \\ &\geq g(\hat{x}) - |g(\hat{x}) - \Gamma| \geq \Gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## A.2. Empirical Validation

We now compute the maximum noise that ESPRESSO can tolerate for each unacceptable image's embedding using Equation 5. Following prior literature on certified robustness [6], we compute the certified accuracy described in [6] to evaluate the robustness of ESPRESSO. Certified accuracy at radius  $r$  is the fraction of unacceptable images which are correctly classified and are robust against adversarial noise  $\delta > r$ . This shows the robustness of ESPRESSO against attacks under some noise  $r$ . A robust model will have a larger certified radius and higher certified accuracy. Since we add noise directly to  $\phi_x(x^u)$ , we compare our certified accuracy with the accuracy of clean unacceptable images (without adversarial noise) which we refer as "clean accuracy". Ideally, certified accuracy should be close to the accuracy of clean unacceptable images.

We present the results in Figure 3 for the three groups of concepts. Clean accuracy in Figure 3 is the certified accuracy at radius zero. ESPRESSO is robust against  $\delta < 0.07$ , incurring less than a 5% drop in certified accuracy. When  $\delta < 0.15$ , the certified accuracy remains higher than 50% for all concepts. ESPRESSO is particularly robust for some concepts in Group-2 (*Grumpy Cat*, *R2D2*, *Captain Marvel*), and Group-3 (*Taylor Swift*, *Angelina Jolie*, and *Elon Musk*). For these concepts, the certified accuracy remains the same for the clean unacceptable images until  $\delta > 0.15$ . Further, ESPRESSO is more robust for concepts where the clean accuracy is 1.00 (CLIP accuracy from Table 2). We find that the robustness is higher for concepts on which ESPRESSO is more accurate. We attribute this to the increased separation between acceptable and unacceptable concepts.

## A.3. Practical Implications







Having discussed the theoretical bound and empirically validated it on different concepts, we now revisit the practicality of this bound. We discuss the usefulness of the certification and revisit our assumption about *Adv*'s capability.

**Usefulness of Certified Bound.** In Figure 3, we find that the certified bound is less than 0.15 across all the concepts. We found this to be smaller than the  $l_2$ -norms of realistic image embeddings, which had a mean of 17. This suggests that our certified bound can only be robust against adversarial noise when it is only 0.8% ( $=0.15/17$ ) of the embeddings.

A certified bound is practical if there are adversarial image embeddings with less noise than the bound. Then, the bound is effective against these embeddings. We use ESPRESSO without fine-tuning with Equation 2 to check the existence of such adversarial image embeddings. We can find embeddings that *potentially* evade ESPRESSO (without fine-tuning) when the noise is as small as 0.028. Our certified bound is useful against such embeddings<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Note that to find an actual attack against ESPRESSO, *Adv* will have to

Table 8. (Column 1) Adversarial image ( $x^{adv}$ ) using PGD [28] against ESPRESSO, (Column 2) adversarial prompt ( $p^{adv}$ ) generated from  $x^{adv}$  using PEZ [45], and (Column 3) image generated by SDv1.4 T2I model using  $p^{adv}$  as input.

Concept	Adversarial Image ( $x^{adv}$ )	Adversarial Prompt ( $p^{adv}$ )	Image Generated from $p^{adv}$
Nudity		"artsy who venus moc bday oiland-goddess thru cropped endurindiefilm cropped r underetal <copyright sign>"	
Nemo		"moma fishy pet <heart emoji> con-strafrm orange optimistic soaking . . . . . vacancy trippy troubles groovy averages ¶"	
Elon Musk		"poet moderstare rested wakeupamerica (" blurred vaportide driverless <smiley emoji> broker celebrated mandelclap"	

However, the distance between acceptable and unacceptable images, which is at least 7, is much larger than the certified bound. This suggests that our certified bound is loose. We leave a tighter certified bound as future work.

**Adv’s Capability.** To compute the certified bound, we assumed a strong *Adv* who can directly add adversarial noise to the *embeddings*. In practice, *Adv* can only modify the *prompts* sent to the T2I model, and can only obtain the corresponding filtered outputs. Hence, in practice, *Adv* is much weaker and the robustness of ESPRESSO is much higher than indicated in Figure 3.

To illustrate this, we consider a concrete attack that *Adv* could adopt given its inability to directly add adversarial noise to embeddings: *Adv* begins with unacceptable images and incorporate adversarial noise using standard evasion techniques (e.g., PGD [28]) to find an adversarial example that evades the ESPRESSO classifier. *Adv* then finds the corresponding adversarial prompt using one of the attacks (e.g., PEZ+). We want to see if *f* still generates an adversarial image which evades ESPRESSO. We use PGD to generate unacceptable images with adversarial noise, and PEZ+ to find

their corresponding adversarial prompts. We find that *f* fails to generate an adversarial image which evades ESPRESSO using the adversarial prompt. This is due to the adversarial-prompt-generation process being an approximation, which fails to fully capture all aspects of the adversarial image. Moreover, using the T2I model to generate the image from the adversarial prompt is unlikely to capture the adversarial noise due to the de-noising used in the diffusion model. This claim is further supported by prior literature on the robustness of diffusion models [5, 18, 46, 54].

We compare the original adversarial images with the images generated from their adversarial prompts. We present one concept from each group in Table 8. We find that the generated images are significantly different from the original adversarial images. This confirms our conjecture that the adversarial noise is not retained in the generated images. A more thorough exploration of such an attack is left as future work. Based on the above preliminary exploration, we conjecture that ESPRESSO is likely to be robust against such attacks by *Adv* with realistic capabilities.

(a) find a prompt that generates this perturbed embedding, and (b) ensure that the resulting image retains the unacceptable content.

## B. Efficiency of CRTs

In Table 9, we report the execution time for fine-tuning or training the CRTs (average across ten runs). For related work, the configuration for fine-tuning/training is the same as specified by their respective paper to satisfy effectiveness and utility. These times were obtained from training on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU.

Table 9. Efficiency: CRT training time (mean across ten runs).

Technique	Time (mins)	Technique	Time (mins)
CA [22]	60.03 $\pm$ 0.01	UCE [13]	0.24 $\pm$ 0.02
SA [15]	95.10 $\pm$ 2.21	ESD [10]	125.50 $\pm$ 0.00
SDD [19]	75.50 $\pm$ 3.21	UD [50]	10.00 $\pm$ 2.03
FMN [51]	2.20 $\pm$ 0.01	<b>ESPRESSO</b>	9.10 $\pm$ 0.05

ESPRESSO is reasonably fast to train. For fine-tuning CRTs, inference time is identical to using the baseline SD v1.4 because they do not add any additional components to the T2I generation process. The inference time for filtering CRTs is marginally higher (+0.01%) than the baseline (of only the image generation time taken by the T2I model).