

Position Paper: Beyond Robustness Against Single Attack Types

Sihui Dai¹ Chong Xiang¹ Tong Wu¹ Prateek Mittal¹

Abstract

Current research on defending against adversarial examples focuses primarily on achieving robustness against a single attack type such as ℓ_2 or ℓ_∞ -bounded attacks. However, the space of possible perturbations is much larger and currently cannot be modeled by a single attack type. The discrepancy between the focus of current defenses and the space of attacks of interest calls to question the practicality of existing defenses and the reliability of their evaluation. In this position paper, we argue that the research community should look beyond single attack robustness, and we draw attention to three potential directions involving robustness against multiple attacks: *simultaneous multiattack robustness*, *unforeseen attack robustness*, and a newly defined problem setting which we call *continual adaptive robustness*. We provide a unified framework which rigorously defines these problem settings, synthesize existing research in these fields, and outline open directions. We hope that our position paper inspires more research in simultaneous multiattack, unforeseen attack, and continual adaptive robustness.

1. Introduction

While current machine learning (ML) models are able to achieve high accuracy on classification tasks such as image classification, these models misclassify when a small imperceptible perturbation is added to the input during test-time. This perturbed image is known as an adversarial example. These adversarial examples can be exploited by an adversary to cause harm in safety-critical applications and raise doubts about model reliability.

Adversarial robustness research consists of two main components: developing new attacks in order to better evaluate robustness and designing stronger defenses that can achieve good performance under the presence of these attacks. Re-

search in designing attacks has led to a wide variety of attacks following different threat models, including spatial transformations (Xiao et al., 2018; Engstrom et al., 2019), color shifts (Laidlaw & Feizi, 2019), JPEG-compression based attacks (Kaufmann et al., 2019), weather-based attacks (Schmalfuss et al., 2023; Kaufmann et al., 2019), Wasserstein distance bounded attacks (Wong et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2020), and perceptual distance based attacks (Laidlaw et al., 2021; Ghazanfari et al., 2023). However, most existing work on defenses has focused on defending against specific narrow threat models (primarily ℓ_∞ and ℓ_2 bounded adversaries) (Madry et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2019; Cohen et al., 2019; Croce et al., 2020). We argue that this discrepancy between the focus of current defenses and the space of existing attacks leads to vulnerability; an attacker can easily breach the defense by using an attack different from the focus of the defense.

In this position paper, we argue that we should look beyond defending against single attack types and encourage more research in three directions in adversarial robustness (Figure 1):

1. *Simultaneous Multiattack robustness (sMAR)* (Figure 1B) (Tramèr & Boneh, 2019; Dai et al., 2023): the problem of defending against multiple attacks of interest *simultaneously*.
2. *Unforeseen attack robustness (UAR)* (Figure 1C) (Dai et al., 2022; 2023; Kaufmann et al., 2019): the problem of making defenses generalize to attacks that the defense is not explicitly designed to defend against.
3. *Continual adaptive robustness (CAR)* (Figure 1D): the problem of designing defenses that allow for efficient adaptation to new attacks *sequentially*, while maintaining robustness on previous attacks in the sequence. We provide the first formulation of CAR in this paper.

To rigorously define these three problem settings, we provide an adversarial game framework which captures these three settings (§3). This game framework specifies the capabilities and objectives of the defender and attacker in each game and sheds insights into the connections between single attack robustness, sMAR, UAR, and CAR. These connections also allow us to understand how improvements in sMAR and UAR can help improve CAR.

We then synthesize existing trends in research in sMAR and

*Equal contribution ¹Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Princeton University. Correspondence to: Sihui Dai <sihuid@princeton.edu>.




Figure 1. **An overview of different directions in adversarial robustness research:** (A) **Single Attack Robustness** (§2). This is the setting commonly studied in prior work. The defender uses information about a single attack (usually an ℓ_p -bounded attack) to output a robust model. This robust model is deployed, and an attacker attacks the model using the same attack type. (B) **Multiattack robustness** (§??). The defender aims to obtain robustness against a set of K different attacks simultaneously. The defender can use information about these attacks to output a robust model. After deployment, an attacker attacks the model with the same set of K attacks. (C) **Unforeseen attack robustness** (§5). After deployment, the attacker attacks the defended model with attacks that were not considered in the design of the defense. (D) **Continual adaptive robustness** (§6). In continual adaptive robustness, the model and adversary are not fixed at deployment. Over time, the adversary can introduce new attacks, and similarly the defender can use information about the previous model and new attacks to update the deployed model to improve robustness against these new attacks.

UAR research and outline open directions for research in sMAR (§4), UAR (§5), and CAR (§6). We hope that our position paper draws the community’s attention to these three important areas of research.

2. Background: Single Attack Robustness

We will introduce the game formulation of the adversarial machine learning problem for single attack types in §2.1 and discuss attacks and defenses proposed in prior works in §2.2 and §2.3.

2.1. A Game Formulation of Single Attack Robustness

A useful notion for defining adversarial robustness is an adversarial game between a defender and an attacker (Huang et al., 2011; Brückner et al., 2012; Bulò et al., 2016; Pinot et al., 2020; Pydi & Jog, 2021; Meunier et al., 2021; Balcan et al., 2023). This game defines robustness (which is the goal of the defender) by specifying the capabilities and limits of

the attacker and defender and the criteria for the defender to win this game. We will now provide a game formulation (adapted from (Huang et al., 2011)) of the setting studied in prior works, which we call *single attack robustness*.

We will use $\mathcal{D} = X \times Y$ to denote the data distribution and \mathcal{H} to denote the space of defended models.

Definition 2.1 (Single Attack Game).

1. The defender chooses a defense algorithm \mathcal{A} for obtaining a robust model using knowledge of the attack space $T : X \rightarrow 2^X$ (space of possible attacks for each input).
2. The attacker then chooses an attack procedure $\tilde{P} : X \times Y \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow X$ to apply after deployment which outputs a perturbation within T for each input. The attacker may also use information about the defense algorithm to determine the attack procedure.
3. Before deployment, the defender uses the defense algorithm to obtain a robust model: $M = \mathcal{A}(D_{\text{train}})$.
4. After deployment, for every test data $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$, the defender evaluates the performance of M on the perturbed

input $\tilde{P}(x, y, M)$. This performance is assessed using a loss function $\ell : Y \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

5. The defender wins if with high probability, M achieves robust error less than a threshold δ_r which can be tolerated for the task $(\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\ell(h(\tilde{P}(x, y, h)), y)] \leq \delta_r)$ and achieves clean error less than a threshold δ_c which can be tolerated for the task $(\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\ell(h(x), y)] \leq \delta_c)$.

From the above game formulation of single attack robustness, we can see that the goal of the defender is to achieve small loss while the attacker aims to prevent this. Meanwhile, the constraints on the defender and adversary is that they can only use attacks in a single attack space T and the capability of the defender is the choice of \mathcal{A} , while the capability of the attacker is the choice of \tilde{P} . We will now discuss these constraints and capabilities in further detail and discuss prior works.

2.2. Attacks in Adversarial ML Research

In the second step of the game formulation of adversarial ML (§2.1), the attacker has flexibility in choosing the attack procedure while conforming to a set *attack space* $S : X \rightarrow 2^X$. For example, a possible attack space is the space of ℓ_2 -bounded perturbations with radius 0.5, which can be modeled via $S(x) = \{x' \mid \|x' - x\|_2 \leq 0.5\}$. The attack space specifies the space of feasible perturbations and can be considered parameterized by an attack type (ie. ℓ_2 attack) and an attack strength (ie. 0.5). Formally, the objective of the adversary is commonly written as:

$$P(x, y, M) = \arg \max_{x' \in S(x)} \ell(M(x'), y) \quad (1)$$

Equation 1 can also be considered the ideal attack and will use the term "attack" to refer to this ideal formulation. This differs from the attack procedure chosen by the adversary in step 2 of Definition 2.1, which is also parameterized by an *optimization procedure*, which specifies the algorithm that the attacker uses to search within this attack space for adversarial examples. An example of an attack procedure \tilde{P} would be to use projected gradient descent (PGD) (Madry et al., 2018) optimization in order approximate P in Equation 1.

Attack Spaces. In the direction of attack spaces, several works look at different forms of perturbations that can occur in practice. One of the most commonly used attack spaces across attack and defense literature is ℓ_p -bounded attacks (Szegedy et al., 2014; Madry et al., 2018; Carlini & Wagner, 2017). Outside of ℓ_p attacks, a wide array of imperceptible attacks have been introduced, such as imperceptible spatial transformations (Xiao et al., 2018), color shifts (Laidlaw et al., 2021), JPEG-compression based attacks (Kaufmann et al., 2019), Wasserstein distance bounded attacks

(Wong et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2020), and LPIPS distance bounded attacks (Laidlaw et al., 2021; Ghazanfari et al., 2023). For computer vision applications models robustness against small distortions is also important. Along this line, several works have proposed looking at weather-based attacks (Kaufmann et al., 2019; Schmalfuss et al., 2023), small spatial transformations (Engstrom et al., 2019), and patch attacks which allow unbounded perturbations only within a small region of the image (Brown et al., 2017; Eykholt et al., 2018).

Optimization Procedure. There have also been many works focused on creating stronger or more efficient attack procedures in order to obtain a more reliable and efficient assessment of robustness in addition to more realistic attacks that only use information obtained from querying the model (black-box attacks) instead of relying on taking model gradients (white-box attacks). For example, many different methods of generating ℓ_∞ or ℓ_2 attacks have been proposed (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Madry et al., 2018; Carlini & Wagner, 2017; Moosavi-Dezfooli et al., 2016; Croce & Hein, 2020b; Gowal et al., 2019; Andriushchenko et al., 2020). There has also been research outside of ℓ_p attacks: for example, Wu et al. (2020) improves optimization procedure for Wasserstein attacks over Wong et al. (2019).

2.3. Defenses in Adversarial ML Research

Prior works on defenses focus mainly on defending against specific attack types. Existing defenses generally fall into 2 categories: empirical defenses and certified defenses. In Appendix A, we demonstrate how different defenses can be captured within the adversarial game framework (Definition 2.1).

Empirical Defenses. Works on empirical defenses demonstrate the strength of the defense by empirically evaluating against strong attacks (of the specific attack space of interest). However, they do not give a guarantee of robustness and many defenses proposed in prior works have been broken by the introduction of attacks with better optimization procedures (Athalye et al., 2018; Tramer et al., 2020), so empirical evaluations of these defenses can give a false sense of security. Of empirical defense literature, adversarial training (Madry et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2019) is a defense which has withstood this test of time. In adversarial training, the robust model is obtained by training using adversarial examples following the attack space of interest. Croce et al. (2020) provides a benchmark which ranks adversarial training based defenses against on robustness against ℓ_p attacks.

Certified Defenses. Unlike empirical defenses, certified defenses give a provable guarantee of robustness and thus cannot be broken by attacks with better optimization procedures. These guarantees are derived from properties of the attack space of interest, so these techniques are tailored

towards a specific attack space. For example, randomized soothing (Cohen et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2020; Salman et al., 2020) and bound propagation (Wong & Kolter, 2018; Mirman et al., 2018) are approaches for achieving certified ℓ_p robustness. Outside of ℓ_p attacks, there are also certified defenses for localized patch attacks (Chiang et al., 2020; Xiang et al., 2021; 2022), geometric transformations (Yang et al., 2023), and natural out-of-distribution data (Lin et al., 2020).

Limitations. We argue that achieving single attack robustness gives a false sense of security. Currently, with the wide variety of proposed attack types, the adversary can utilize any of these attack types to attack the model. This makes the attacker’s single attack space constraint in the single attack game (Definition 2.1) unrealistic.

Additionally, the paradigm of evaluating a defense only on the single attack that the defense is targeted towards gives an unreliable measure of true robustness. Currently, defenses against single attacks do not necessarily generalize to other attack types. For example, Dai et al. (2022) demonstrates that a model adversarially trained for ℓ_2 attacks with radius 0.5 can achieve 66.65% robust accuracy on those attacks, but only 0.76% robust accuracy on spatial attacks (Xiao et al., 2018).

The impracticality of research in single attack robustness have also been highlighted by Gilmer et al. (2018) and Florian Tramer (2021). We deviate from these works by specifically highlighting the importance of research in robustness against multiple attacks, synthesizing existing work in this direction, and outlining open problems.

3. Position: Moving Beyond Single Attack Robustness Research

We argue that there is a need for more works looking at the problem of achieving robustness against multiple attacks. To move towards more realistic defense settings and more realistic evaluations of those defenses, we propose several directions of improvement:

1. Designing defenses which are able to incorporate knowledge of multiple attacks into the defense design.
2. Evaluating defenses with attacks using attack spaces outside of the attack space that the defender specifically designed the defense against.
3. Designing defenses that can quickly adapt a robust model to also be robust against an attack of a new attack space.

The first point corresponds to the field of *simultaneous multi-attack robustness*. Multiattack defenses allow us incorporate information about multiple attacks into the design, which allows us to achieve robustness against a wider scope of attack spaces.

The second point corresponds to *unforeseen attack robustness*. Unforeseen attack robustness is a multiple attack problem with the goal of making defenses generalize to attack spaces that were not considered in the design of the defense. This is important because there may be future attack spaces that we currently do not know about. Achieving unforeseen robustness would allow us to guarantee that our model does not completely fail when a new attack is introduced.

The third point corresponds to *continual adaptive robustness*. Continual adaptive robustness is a multiple attack problem where an attacker and defender can learn about new attack spaces over time and adjust their defense or attack strategy over time. In this case, the defender would want to quickly adapt their model to now also be robust against new attacks.

We provide a diagram of these three settings in comparison to single attack robustness in Figure 1. In the following sections, we give a more rigorous definition of each problem, discuss current research within these fields, and suggest potential directions for further research.

3.1. A Unified Framework for Robustness Problems

We now provide a game formulation which can capture single attack robustness, simultaneous multiattack robustness, unforeseen attack robustness, and continual adaptive robustness. This unified framework allows us to understand connections between these different robustness problems. We begin by defining adaptive knowledge sets which are a fundamental component of this game formulation.

Definition 3.1 (Adaptive Defender and Attacker Knowledge Sets). The adaptive defender knowledge set $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ is time dependent function which outputs a set of attack spaces $T : X \rightarrow 2^X$ representing the set of attack spaces known to the defender at time t . This function satisfies the property that $\forall t_1 < t_2, \mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t_1) \subseteq \mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t_2)$ ¹. At time t , the defense algorithm chosen by the defender can incorporate information about attack spaces in $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$. Similarly, the attacker knowledge set $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$ is a time dependent function that outputs a set of attack spaces that the attacker is allowed to use in order to attack the model at time t .

We now give an updated adversarial game similar to Definition 2.1 to serve as the basis of defining multiattack (§4), unforeseen attack (§5), and continual adaptive robustness (§6).

Definition 3.2 (Multiple Attack Game).

1. The defender uses information from $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}$ to select a defense algorithm \mathcal{A} for obtaining a robust model.
2. The attacker then defines a time-dependent set of attack procedures $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(t)$ where each element $\tilde{P} : X \times Y \times$

¹This property is due to the fact that in practice once a attack space is known to the defender (or similarly attacker), it is known to them for all future times.

$\mathcal{H} \rightarrow X$. All attacks in $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(t)$ conform to attack spaces in $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$. The attacker can define $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(t)$ based on \mathcal{A} ².

3. Before deployment, the defender obtains a time dependent model $\mathbf{M}(t) = \mathcal{A}(D_{\text{train}}, \{\mathbf{M}(i) | 0 \leq i < t\})$ which can use information from previous time steps.
4. After deployment, for every test data $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$, the defender evaluates the performance of $\mathbf{M}(t)$ on the perturbed input $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(t)$ for each time t . This performance is assessed using a loss function for multiple attacks L which takes a model and set of perturbations as input.
5. The defender wins if with high probability $\forall t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{M}(t)$ achieves robust error less than a threshold δ_r that can be tolerated for the task ($L(\mathbf{M}(t), \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(t)) \leq \delta_r$) and achieves clean error less than a threshold δ_c which can be tolerated for the task.

Choices for loss function L . We note that in Definition 3.2, performance is measured with respect to a loss L which takes in a model M and set of attacks K that we want to evaluate on. L generally provides a way of computing a loss from a set of attacks using a loss function for single attacks ℓ . We now provide some examples of L .

Average over attacks. One simple loss function which has been used by prior work is average performance over attacks (Tramèr & Boneh, 2019) and is defined below.

$$L_{\text{avg}}(M, K) = \frac{1}{k} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^k \ell(M(\tilde{P}_i(x, y, M)), y) \quad (2)$$

Worst case over attacks. Another loss function used by prior works (Tramèr & Boneh, 2019; Maini et al., 2020) measures the worst-case performance over attacks, which can also be thought of as robustness against the union of all attack spaces. We provide the definition below.

$$L_{\text{worst}}(M, K) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \max_{\tilde{P} \in K} \ell(M(\tilde{P}(x, y, M)), y) \quad (3)$$

Compositions of attacks. Prior works have also looked at achieving compositional robustness (Hsiung et al., 2022; 2023). Here, the attacker can apply all perturbations to a single image sequentially, so the defender would like to achieve robustness against the worst-case sequence of attacks. We provide the definition below where K_i denotes the i th perturbation contained in K .

$$L_{\text{comp}}(M, K) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \max_{i_1, \dots, i_{|K|} \in \{1 \dots |K|\}} \ell(M(K_{i_1}(\dots(K_{i_{|K|}}(x, y, M))))), y) \quad (4)$$

²Here, the extent to which the attacker can use information about the \mathcal{A} dictates whether this is a white-box or black-box attack. For example, if the attacker can use information about gradient through each model, this would be a white-box attack.

Connection to Single Attack Game. There are three components in the multiple attack game (Definition 3.2) that are not captured by the single attack game (Definition 2.1). The first is that the attacker and defender both work with sets of attacks rather than individual attacks in the single attack game, which is important for modeling simultaneous multiattack robustness (see §4). The second is that the attack spaces used by the defender in choosing \mathcal{A} can now differ from the attack spaces used by the attacker for defining $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$, which is important for modeling unforeseen robustness (see §5). Lastly, the general game incorporates time dependency which is not present in the single attack game and is important for modeling continual adaptive robustness (see §6). The single attack game can be considered a special instance of the multiple attack game where $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ is constant across all t , $|\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(0)| = 1$, and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}$.

Applications of Multiple Attack Robustness. Some domains in which robustness against multiple types of attacks are important are the image and language domains. Some examples of applications include:

- **Social media filtering.** We want to ensure that we can accurately filter out harmful posts even if an adversary perturbs images using different forms of image transformations or uses different forms of paraphrasing and misspellings in order to avoid filtering.
- **Surveillance.** In some settings, we may want to monitor and identify harmful behavior through surveillance. It is important that we can accurately identify this behavior even if an adversary intentionally tries to evade detection by using different clothing designs (Xu et al., 2020).
- **Face authentication.** For secure face authentication, it is important that small perturbations which might not be modelled via ℓ_p bounded attacks (ie. lighting changes, spatial shifts) do not cause an adversary to succeed at impersonating someone else.
- **Watermarking.** It is important for watermarking that small imperceptible perturbations of different types (ie. ℓ_p perturbations, spatial perturbations, small color shifts) are unable to remove the watermark.

4. Multiattack Robustness

One direction in adversarial ML research that can be further explored to improve the practicality of algorithms for adversarial robustness is simultaneous multiattack robustness (sMAR). sMAR aims to create defenses that can *incorporate knowledge of different attacks during training*.

Problem Formulation. sMAR is modeled by the multiple attack game (Definition 3.2) when $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ is constant across all t , $|\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(0)| > 1$, and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}$. Figure 1B diagrams this setting.

Significance. Currently, attacks of many different attack spaces exist (Szegedy et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2017; Xiao et al., 2018; Kaufmann et al., 2019; Wong et al., 2019; Laidlaw & Feizi, 2019), and ideally, we would like to achieve robustness against all attacks. Defenses for sMAR can benefit from knowing about new attacks in order to create defenses that are applicable to a wider variety of attacks than single attack defenses.

4.1. Prior Work in simultaneous multiattack robustness

Prior work in sMAR generally employ adversarial training based approaches in order to achieve robustness on a group of adversaries. Tramèr & Boneh (2019) propose AVG and MAX algorithms for training for sMAR. These algorithms employ adversarial training with a modified objective function that directly optimizes for low average loss across attacks or low worst case loss across attacks (as in Equations 2 and 3). Madaan et al. (2020) propose using random sampling to choose attacks to apply for each batch during training and propose using a noise generator and extra data in order to further improve robust performance across attacks.

Other works on multiattack defenses focus on defending on unions of ℓ_p balls. Maini et al. (2020) propose a modification of PGD-based adversarial training, which considers using worst case attack at the end of a PGD iteration to be the starting point for the next PGD iteration. Croce & Hein (2020a) prove that a model that is robust against ℓ_∞ and ℓ_1 attacks, is also provably robust against other ℓ_p attacks (with robust radius as a function of the ℓ_∞ and ℓ_1 robust radius). Croce & Hein (2022) build off of this work and propose initially training with a single ℓ_p attack and then using finetuning with ℓ_∞ and ℓ_1 attacks in order to obtain a model that is robust against other ℓ_p attacks. Sriramanan et al. (2022) propose using regularization with single step- ℓ_p attacks for improving efficiency.

While previously discussed works focus on obtaining high average-case and worst-case robust accuracy, Hsiung et al. (2023) proposes a training procedure for optimizing over the worst case sequence of attacks for compositional robustness (objective defined in Equation 4). The authors also propose a corresponding benchmark for evaluating robustness on compositions of attacks (Hsiung et al., 2022).

4.2. Open Directions for Research

While several works have looked at the problem of sMAR, the application of some of these approaches is limited and we still lack an understanding of how well we can expect algorithms to perform in this setting. We now outline several possible directions for future research on the topic of sMAR.

Formulation of attack spaces. Currently, a large challenge

for sMAR is that we do not have a good formulation of the space of attacks that we would like to be robust to. More research in formulating attack spaces can help with the design of more defenses for multiple attacks, especially certified defenses which need a rigorous formulation of the attack space. Currently, there is only 1 work on a certified defense for unions of ℓ_p balls (Croce & Hein, 2020a).

General defenses that can work with any attack. Several works in sMAR look at achieving robustness specifically against ℓ_p balls and take advantage of using knowledge of the exact process for generating adversarial examples (Maini et al., 2020) or geometry of the attack space (Croce & Hein, 2020a; 2022). This prevents these approaches from being applicable to attacks of other attacks. For general attack spaces, there is little work outside of using basic adversarial training with modified objectives for average-case and worst-case multiattack performance (Tramèr & Boneh, 2019). This is a potential space in which more research can occur.

Understanding and balancing tradeoffs between attacks and performance on unperturbed examples. Previous works demonstrate that we can expect tradeoffs in robust accuracy between attacks (Tramèr & Boneh, 2019) and with clean accuracy (Tsipras et al., 2019; Stutz et al., 2019), but outside of tradeoffs between different ℓ_p attacks (Croce & Hein, 2020a), it is unclear how much tradeoff is expected and how to effectively balance these tradeoffs. In current literature, there are no works suggesting algorithmic approaches to tuning this tradeoff between different attacks. We encourage more works to study this problem and understanding these tradeoffs can allow for better multiattack defenses.

Efficiently training with multiple attacks. As new attacks conforming to different attack spaces are introduced, how we can efficiently train with all attacks becomes an important problem. Currently the best performing methods require generating all attacks for each example during training, which can be computationally expensive, especially as the number of attacks increases, while more efficient approaches (Madaan et al., 2020; Croce & Hein, 2022; Sriramanan et al., 2022) generally trade-off robust accuracy and have not been tested outside of ℓ_p attacks. Research on improving the efficiency of multiattack training (or efficiency of generating attacks of different attack spaces) can make multiattack defenses more practical in the long run.

Ensembling. One potential direction that may be useful is ensembling. Since many prior works focus on achieving robustness against single attacks, a possible direction is exploring how to ensemble singly robust models in order to achieve sMAR. We encourage more research in ensembling for sMAR as it allows improvements in single attack robustness to carry over to the multiattack setting.

5. Unforeseen Attack Robustness

In the previous section, we discussed simultaneous multiattack robustness, which focuses on allowing defenses to utilize knowledge of other attacks *in training*. In this section, we will discuss the problem of unforeseen attack robustness (UAR) which can be considered a multiattack problem where the focus is on defense *evaluation* rather than training. In UAR, the defense is evaluated on attacks outside of the attack space considered in the design of the defense, known as an unforeseen attack. For example, a model robust against ℓ_2 attacks can be evaluated on a spatial attack during test time.

Problem Formulation. UAR is modeled by the multiple attack game (Definition 3.2) when $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$ are constant across all t and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(0)$ differs from $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(0)$. Specifically, there are perturbations in the space of $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(0)$ that cannot be fully captured by scope of attack spaces $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(0)$. Mathematically, for some input x , $\bigcup_{T_d \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(0)} T_d(x) \neq \bigcup_{T_a \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(0)} T_a(x)$ and $\bigcup_{T_a \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(0)} T_a(x) \not\subseteq \bigcup_{T_d \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(0)} T_d(x)$. This setting is also known as knowledge mismatch, while the opposite setting is known as full knowledge (Dai et al., 2023). Figure 2 provides a visualization of these problem settings based on intersections of attack spaces. Figure 1C provides an overview diagram of UAR aligned with its formulation in the multiple attack game.

Significance. UAR is an important setting of research as new attacks as the space of possible perturbations can be hard to mathematically model. For example, modeling human perceptual distances is a research direction (Wang et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2018). This means that new attack spaces may be discovered and utilized by an attacker in the future which may be able to capture more of the true space of possible perturbations. Defenses with good UAR performance are able to generalize well to new future attack types, meaning that the performance of these defenses does not drop drastically upon the introduction of a new attack.

5.1. Prior Work in Unforeseen Attack Robustness

Currently, few works have looked at the problem of UAR. One line of works looks at using approximations to model the true attack space. Laidlaw et al. (2021) proposes using adversarial training with adversarial examples generated based on perceptually aligned distance metrics (specifically LPIPS metric (Zhang et al., 2018)) instead of ℓ_p metrics. They find that training with these examples leads to models robust against imperceptible attacks such as ℓ_p attacks, spatial attacks (Xiao et al., 2018), and color change attacks (Laidlaw & Feizi, 2019). Ghazanfari et al. (2023) extend this work by pointing out vulnerabilities the LPIPS metric and designing a modified distance metric R-LPIPS, which




Figure 2. **Full knowledge vs knowledge mismatch.** The white box represents the space of possible perturbations that we would expect a model to be robust to (ie. space of imperceptible perturbations) which we may not know how to model. The green oval represents the space of perturbations captured in the defender knowledge set and the red oval represents the space of perturbations captured in the attacker knowledge set. (A) **Full knowledge** occurs when the defender knows the space known to the attacker while (B) **Knowledge mismatch** occurs when there exist perturbations known to the attacker that are not known to the defender. Robustness in this setting corresponds to *unforeseen attack robustness*.

they then use with adversarial training.

Another line of works in defense literature uses regularization to improve UAR. Dai et al. (2022) introduce a regularization term called variation regularization which encourages feature representations between inputs lying within attack spaces in the defender knowledge set to be close in ℓ_2 distance. They demonstrate that this regularization greatly improves robustness on unforeseen (imperceptible) attacks and combine the regularization with LPIPS training (Laidlaw et al., 2021) in order to obtain state-of-the-art performance on UAR. Jin & Rinard (2020) propose training with a series of regularization terms including regularizing Hamming distance between activation patterns and ℓ_2 distance of outputs of noisy inputs. They demonstrate that without adversarial training, they can obtain robust models against ℓ_p and Wasserstein attacks (Wong et al., 2019) (although at the cost of a large tradeoff in clean accuracy).

A related line of works looks at the problem of detecting unforeseen examples and abstaining on those examples. Stutz et al. (2020), which uses regularizes training so that ℓ_p attacks with larger norm than used in training have more uniform confidence and then uses confidence based thresholding in order to determine whether to predict or abstain. Meanwhile, Chen et al. (2022) proposes an algorithm for jointly training a classifier network and detector network in order to robustly classify on examples with small ℓ_p perturbations and reject those with large ℓ_p perturbations.

In terms of evaluating and UAR, Kaufmann et al. (2019) propose a set of 18 different attacks outside of ℓ_p attacks and a corresponding metric for aggregating performance across these attacks into a score representing the UAR. Dai et al. (2022) introduce a set of metrics for measuring average

case and worst case performance across a set of 9 attacks (including a subset from (Kaufmann et al., 2019)) at 20 different attack strengths. They also provide a leaderboard for CIFAR-10 dataset which allows for ranking and visualizing the performance of existing multiattack and unforeseen attack defenses against this set of attacks.

5.2. Open Directions for Research

We now discuss limitations of existing works and outline several directions for further research.

Perturbation modeling with generative models. Currently the bulk of research in UAR focuses on improving robustness against the space of imperceptible adversaries; however, for computer vision applications there can be adversarial perturbations that are visible (ie. weather conditions (Kaufmann et al., 2019), patch attacks (Brown et al., 2017)) which we want models to be robust to. Rather than modeling the space of attacks using a perceptual distance metric, can we use generative models to learn the space of attacks to generate realistic perturbations for use with adversarial training? This idea has been explored in Wong & Kolter (2020) for modeling specific types of perturbations (such as lighting changes) for single attack robustness, but not for UAR.

Theoretical study. There is little theoretical understanding for when we can expect to generalize to unforeseen attacks. For regularization based approaches, Dai et al. (2022) use an argument based on lipschitzness to demonstrate that regularization may help with robustness against unforeseen attacks, but given an attack that a defense may be robust to, there is little understanding of what other types of attacks the defense can generalize to. For works that propose using approximations to the true attack space to achieve robustness, there is no theoretical work on why this is expected to succeed. In what setting can noisy approximations of the true attack space allow us to generalize to the true attack space of interest? Further understanding the conditions in which we expect regularization or perturbation modeling to work can help with inspiring the design of defenses.

Managing tradeoff with clean accuracy. Dai et al. (2022) and Jin & Rinard (2020) observe significant tradeoffs with clean accuracy when applying regularization for improving UAR. For example, On CIFAR-10, Jin & Rinard (2020) achieves only 69.95% clean accuracy in order to obtain robustness on ℓ_∞ , ℓ_2 , and Wasserstein attacks, while Dai et al. (2022) demonstrates that increasing regularization strength, which improves unforeseen robustness, also decreases clean accuracy. This tradeoff is also present in Laidlaw et al. (2021)’s LPIPS trained model; the best performing across unforeseen attacks on CIFAR-10 only achieves 71.6% robust accuracy. Thus, another direction is understanding why this tradeoff occurs and how we can reduce it.

Efficient evaluation. To properly assess true UAR it is important to have a large variety of strong attacks to evaluate with which may be computationally expensive. For example, due to large evaluation times, MultiRobustBench Dai et al. (2023) is currently restricted to CIFAR-10, and the only architectures present on the leaderboard are ResNet-18, WRN-28-10, and ResNet-50 which are much smaller than the best performing WRN-70-16 models on the Robustbench leaderboard (Croce et al., 2020). The computational inefficiency faced by Dai et al. (2023) is due to the 180 total evaluations, 60 of which are AutoAttack (Croce & Hein, 2020b) evaluations for ℓ_p robustness which are known to give a reliable assessment of ℓ_p robustness at the cost of computational inefficiency. Kaufmann et al. (2019), despite proposing 18 different attacks, only evaluates with 8 attacks at 3 attack strengths in order to efficiently evaluate on ImageNet. Thus improving evaluation efficiency and reliability can also help with benchmark new defenses.

6. Continual Adversarial Robustness

We now introduce continual adaptive robustness, a new direction that connects simultaneous multiattack robustness with unforeseen robustness research. In practice, even after a model is deployed, it can be updated in order to improve performance. Over time, the defender may learn about the presence of new attacks and want to adjust their deployed model to be robust against the new attack. CAR is the problem of designing defenses that allow for *efficient adaptation to new attacks*.

Problem Formulation. The setting of CAR is the most general setting captured by the multiple attack game (Definition 3.2). Unlike single, multi-, and unforeseen attack robustness, CAR allows for time dependency in knowledge sets, and the attacker and defender can update their attack or defense strategy when their knowledge sets incorporate a new attack. Figure 1D diagrams the CAR setting.

Significance. Out of all robustness problems discussed in this paper, CAR is the most realistic as it considers the defender and attacker in a dynamic setting. CAR captures settings in which a new vulnerability is discovered via updates to the defender and attacker knowledge adaptive knowledge sets ($\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$). To demonstrate this, consider the following three possible events which can occur at some time t after a company deploys a model that is robust against existing attack spaces:

1. *A research group publishes a paper introducing a new attack space.* This setting can be modeled by CAR, where at time t when the research group publishes their paper, $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$ both update to include this new attack space.
2. *An adversary discovers a new vulnerability.* This setting

can be modeled by CAR, where $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$ is updated to include this new attack space.

3. *The security team discovers a new vulnerability.* This setting can be modeled by CAR, where $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ is updated to include this new attack space.

Connection to multiattack and unforeseen attack robustness. Since CAR is the most general robustness setting in the multiple attack game (Definition 3.2), multiattack and unforeseen attack robustness can be thought of as subproblems of CAR. Specifically, these subproblems can be thought of as what happens in CAR at a fixed time so applying UAR/sMAR defenses at each individual time step can serve as a baseline for CAR performance.

Importance of defense efficiency. While UAR and sMAR defenses can partially address the problem of CAR, the CAR problem is more intricate due to time dependency, making *the runtime of the defense algorithm significantly impact performance*. To illustrate, consider the case that at some time t , both $\mathbf{K}_{\text{defender}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\text{attacker}}(t)$ update to include a new attack and let t_A denote the time taken by the defense algorithm to generate a robust model. Then the updated robust model can only be deployed after time $t + t_A$, while in the worst case, the attacker begins attacking the model at time t . Thus, less efficient defenses result in exposure to more “unforeseen” attacks. This adds a third dimension of intricacy faced by CAR; not only does CAR face UAR and sMAR, it also needs to balance performance between these two via algorithm runtime.

6.1. Open Directions for Research

Since CAR is new problem setting, there have not been any works that directly address this problem. We now discuss open directions of research for improving CAR.

Finetuning-based Defense Algorithms. One potential direction is looking at how to efficiently finetune robust models to be robust against new attacks. Of existing works aimed towards achieving good sMAR performance, [Croce & Hein \(2022\)](#) proposes a finetuning approach which can be applied to the CAR problem. However, the focus of this work is on robustness against unions of ℓ_p attacks and it is unclear whether it performs well when extended to non- ℓ_p attacks. Thus, it is currently unclear what finetuning procedures can work well for general attack types. We encourage more works on improving finetuning but with a broader scope of attacks.

Continual Learning. We note that the setting of CAR is also similar to continual learning ([Wang et al., 2023](#)), but rather than adapting to new tasks, we adapt to new attacks. A few interesting directions of research are understanding the connections between continual learning and CAR; for example, do problems faced in continual learning such as

catastrophic forgetting arise in the same manner in CAR, and can algorithms for continual learning be modified to address the CAR problem?

Test-Time Adaptation. Test-time adaptation (TTA) is an approach used in prior work on domain adaptation in order to adapt models to new domains after deployment ([Wang et al., 2020](#); [Gong et al., 2022](#)). Another potential direction for exploration is whether techniques in TTA can be adapted to allow for adaptation to new adversarial perturbations. TTA also raises more questions and challenges in the CAR setting due to the presence of an adversary. For example, [Wu et al. \(2023\)](#) demonstrated that TTA is vulnerable to poisoning and must be implemented robustly to avoid having this vulnerability exploited by the CAR adversary.

Distribution Shifts over Time. Just as the space of attacks can change over time, we may also see changes in distribution. Another interesting problem to study is how in-distribution and out-of-distribution examples can be utilized in order to achieve good CAR in conjunction to distributional shifts.

Standardized Evaluation. Another important direction is benchmarking. One basic evaluation procedure is to consider a fixed sequence of different attacks and measure accuracy on this sequence before and after adapting to each attack. However, it may be that an algorithm can more easily adapt to one ordering of the attacks than another so having a fixed arbitrary sequence may lead to an unfair comparison. Additionally, using this evaluation procedure does not take into account the runtime of each model update which is critical to CAR. We invite more research on creating a standardized benchmark for evaluating CAR, which we believe will also help inspire more research in this field.

7. Conclusion

In this position paper, we argue in the midst of large variety of proposed attack types, single attack robustness gives a false sense of security. We draw attention to three directions of research which can greatly improve the practicality of adversarial ML research: *multiattack robustness* (MAR), *unforeseen robustness* (UAR), and *continual adaptive robustness* (CAR). CAR is a new direction proposed in this paper which unifies MAR and UAR and studies robustness where the attacker and defender are in a dynamic. In our position paper, we provide a unified framework for settings and outline open problems. We hope that this position paper inspires further research in these fields.

References

Andriushchenko, M., Croce, F., Flammarion, N., and Hein, M. Square attack: a query-efficient black-box adversarial

- attack via random search. In *European conference on computer vision*, pp. 484–501. Springer, 2020.
- Athalye, A., Carlini, N., and Wagner, D. Obfuscated gradients give a false sense of security: Circumventing defenses to adversarial examples. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 274–283. PMLR, 2018.
- Balcan, M.-F., Pukdee, R., Ravikumar, P., and Zhang, H. Nash equilibria and pitfalls of adversarial training in adversarial robustness games. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 9607–9636. PMLR, 2023.
- Brown, T. B., Mané, D., Roy, A., Abadi, M., and Gilmer, J. Adversarial patch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.09665*, 2017.
- Brückner, M., Kanzow, C., and Scheffer, T. Static prediction games for adversarial learning problems. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):2617–2654, 2012.
- Bulò, S. R., Biggio, B., Pillai, I., Pelillo, M., and Roli, F. Randomized prediction games for adversarial machine learning. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 28(11):2466–2478, 2016.
- Carlini, N. and Wagner, D. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pp. 39–57. IEEE, 2017.
- Chen, J., Raghuram, J., Choi, J., Wu, X., Liang, Y., and Jha, S. Revisiting adversarial robustness of classifiers with a reject option. In *The AAAI-22 Workshop on Adversarial Machine Learning and Beyond*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Uif3RTES7pU>.
- Chiang, P.-Y., Ni, R., Abdelkader, A., Zhu, C., Studor, C., and Goldstein, T. Certified defenses for adversarial patches. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- Cohen, J. M., Rosenfeld, E., and Kolter, J. Z. Certified adversarial robustness via randomized smoothing. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1310–1320. PMLR, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/cohen19c.html>.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Provable robustness against all adversarial ℓ_p -perturbations for ℓ_q -models. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020a. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=rklk_ySYPB.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2206–2216. PMLR, 2020b.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Adversarial robustness against multiple and single ℓ_p -threat models via quick fine-tuning of robust classifiers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4436–4454. PMLR, 2022.
- Croce, F., Andriushchenko, M., Sehwag, V., Debenedetti, E., Flammarion, N., Chiang, M., Mittal, P., and Hein, M. Robustbench: a standardized adversarial robustness benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09670*, 2020.
- Dai, S., Mahloujifar, S., and Mittal, P. Formulating robustness against unforeseen attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.13779*, 2022.
- Dai, S., Mahloujifar, S., Xiang, C., Sehwag, V., Chen, P.-Y., and Mittal, P. MultiRobustBench: Benchmarking robustness against multiple attacks. In Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 6760–6785. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/dai23c.html>.
- Engstrom, L., Tran, B., Tsipras, D., Schmidt, L., and Madry, A. Exploring the landscape of spatial robustness. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1802–1811. PMLR, 2019.
- Eykholt, K., Evtimov, I., Fernandes, E., Li, B., Rahmati, A., Xiao, C., Prakash, A., Kohno, T., and Song, D. Robust physical-world attacks on deep learning visual classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 1625–1634, 2018.
- Florian Tramer. Adversarial machine learning rising star award presentation. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U1uOsSnIQOw>, 8 2021.
- Ghazanfari, S., Garg, S., Krishnamurthy, P., Khorrami, F., and Araujo, A. R-lips: An adversarially robust perceptual similarity metric. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15157*, 2023.
- Gilmer, J., Adams, R. P., Goodfellow, I., Andersen, D., and Dahl, G. E. Motivating the rules of the game for adversarial example research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06732*, 2018.
- Gong, T., Jeong, J., Kim, T., Kim, Y., Shin, J., and Lee, S.-J. Note: Robust continual test-time adaptation against temporal correlation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27253–27266, 2022.

- Goodfellow, I. J., Shlens, J., and Szegedy, C. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- Gowal, S., Uesato, J., Qin, C., Huang, P.-S., Mann, T., and Kohli, P. An alternative surrogate loss for pgd-based adversarial testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09338*, 2019.
- Hsiung, L., Tsai, Y.-Y., Chen, P.-Y., and Ho, T.-Y. CAR-BEN: Composite Adversarial Robustness Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, July 2022.
- Hsiung, L., Tsai, Y.-Y., Chen, P.-Y., and Ho, T.-Y. Towards compositional adversarial robustness: Generalizing adversarial training to composite semantic perturbations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 24658–24667, 2023.
- Huang, L., Joseph, A. D., Nelson, B., Rubinstein, B. I., and Tygar, J. D. Adversarial machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Workshop on Security and Artificial Intelligence, AISec ’11*, pp. 43–58, New York, NY, USA, 2011. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450310031. doi: 10.1145/2046684.2046692. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2046684.2046692>.
- Jin, C. and Rinard, M. Manifold regularization for locally stable deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04286*, 2020.
- Kaufmann, M., Kang, D., Sun, Y., Basart, S., Yin, X., Mazeika, M., Arora, A., Dziedzic, A., Boenisch, F., Brown, T., et al. Testing robustness against unforeseen adversaries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08016*, 2019.
- Laidlaw, C. and Feizi, S. Functional adversarial attacks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Laidlaw, C., Singla, S., and Feizi, S. Perceptual adversarial robustness: Defense against unseen threat models. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dFwBosAcJkN>.
- Lin, W.-A., Lau, C. P., Levine, A., Chellappa, R., and Feizi, S. Dual manifold adversarial robustness: Defense against lp and non-lp adversarial attacks. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Madaan, D., Shin, J., and Hwang, S. J. Learning to generate noise for robustness against multiple perturbations. *CoRR*, abs/2006.12135, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.12135>.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. 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. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJzIBfZAb>.
- Maini, P., Wong, E., and Kolter, J. Z. Adversarial robustness against the union of multiple perturbation models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 6640–6650. PMLR, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/maini20a.html>.
- Meunier, L., Scetbon, M., Pinot, R. B., Atif, J., and Chevalleyre, Y. Mixed nash equilibria in the adversarial examples game. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 7677–7687. PMLR, 2021.
- Mirman, M., Gehr, T., and Vechev, M. Differentiable abstract interpretation for provably robust neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3578–3586. PMLR, 2018.
- Moosavi-Dezfooli, S.-M., Fawzi, A., and Frossard, P. Deepfool: a simple and accurate method to fool deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 2574–2582, 2016.
- Pinot, R., Ettegui, R., Rizk, G., Chevalleyre, Y., and Atif, J. Randomization matters how to defend against strong adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 7717–7727. PMLR, 2020.
- Pydi, M. S. and Jog, V. The many faces of adversarial risk. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 10000–10012, 2021.
- Salman, H., Sun, M., Yang, G., Kapoor, A., and Kolter, J. Z. Denoised smoothing: A provable defense for pretrained classifiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:21945–21957, 2020.
- Schmalzfuss, J., Mehl, L., and Bruhn, A. Distracting downpour: Adversarial weather attacks for motion estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 10106–10116, October 2023.

- Sriramanan, G., Gor, M., and Feizi, S. Toward efficient robust training against union of ℓ_p threat models. In Koyejo, S., Mohamed, S., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., Cho, K., and Oh, A. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 25870–25882. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/a627b9468c319c13a70b7c2fb8df65a3-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- Stutz, D., Hein, M., and Schiele, B. Disentangling adversarial robustness and generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 6976–6987, 2019.
- Stutz, D., Hein, M., and Schiele, B. Confidence-calibrated adversarial training: Generalizing to unseen attacks. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 9155–9166. PMLR, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/stutz20a.html>.
- Szegedy, C., Zaremba, W., Sutskever, I., Bruna, J., Erhan, D., Goodfellow, I. J., and Fergus, R. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (eds.), *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199>.
- Tramèr, F. and Boneh, D. Adversarial training and robustness for multiple perturbations. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.13000>.
- Tramer, F., Carlini, N., Brendel, W., and Madry, A. On adaptive attacks to adversarial example defenses. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1633–1645, 2020.
- Tsipras, D., Santurkar, S., Engstrom, L., Turner, A., and Madry, A. Robustness may be at odds with accuracy. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, number 2019, 2019.
- Wang, D., Shelhamer, E., Liu, S., Olshausen, B., and Darrell, T. Tent: Fully test-time adaptation by entropy minimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Wang, L., Zhang, X., Su, H., and Zhu, J. A comprehensive survey of continual learning: Theory, method and application. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00487*, 2023.
- Wang, Z., Bovik, A., Sheikh, H., and Simoncelli, E. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004. doi: 10.1109/TIP.2003.819861.
- Wong, E. and Kolter, J. Z. Learning perturbation sets for robust machine learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Wong, E. and Kolter, Z. Provable defenses against adversarial examples via the convex outer adversarial polytope. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 5286–5295. PMLR, 2018.
- Wong, E., Schmidt, F. R., and Kolter, J. Z. Wasserstein adversarial examples via projected sinkhorn iterations. *CoRR*, abs/1902.07906, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.07906>.
- Wu, K., Wang, A., and Yu, Y. Stronger and faster wasserstein adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10377–10387. PMLR, 2020.
- Wu, T., Jia, F., Qi, X., Wang, J. T., Sehwal, V., Mahloujifar, S., and Mittal, P. Uncovering adversarial risks of test-time adaptation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 37456–37495. PMLR, 2023.
- Xiang, C., Bhagoji, A. N., Sehwal, V., and Mittal, P. Patchguard: A provably robust defense against adversarial patches via small receptive fields and masking. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, 2021.
- Xiang, C., Mahloujifar, S., and Mittal, P. Patchcleanser: Certifiably robust defense against adversarial patches for any image classifier. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security)*, 2022.
- Xiao, C., Zhu, J., Li, B., He, W., Liu, M., and Song, D. Spatially transformed adversarial examples. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2018. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HydRMZC->.
- Xu, K., Zhang, G., Liu, S., Fan, Q., Sun, M., Chen, H., Chen, P.-Y., Wang, Y., and Lin, X. Adversarial t-shirt! evading person detectors in a physical world. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part V 16*, pp. 665–681. Springer, 2020.
- Yang, G., Duan, T., Hu, J. E., Salman, H., Razenshteyn, I., and Li, J. Randomized smoothing of all shapes and sizes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 10693–10705. PMLR, 2020.

- Yang, R., Laurel, J., Misailovic, S., and Singh, G. Provable defense against geometric transformations. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023*, 2023.
- Zhang, D., Ye, M., Gong, C., Zhu, Z., and Liu, Q. Black-box certification with randomized smoothing: A functional optimization based framework. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2316–2326, 2020.
- Zhang, H., Yu, Y., Jiao, J., Xing, E. P., Ghaoui, L. E., and Jordan, M. I. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2019, 9-15 June 2019, Long Beach, California, USA*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 7472–7482. PMLR, 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/zhang19p.html>.
- Zhang, R., Isola, P., Efros, A. A., Shechtman, E., and Wang, O. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pp. 586–595. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE Computer Society, 2018. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2018.00068. URL http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_cvpr_2018/html/Zhang_The_Unreasonable_Effectiveness_CVPR_2018_paper.html.

A. Instantiating the Single Attack Game

In Section 2, we introduced the adversarial game for single attacks and then discussed defenses proposed in prior works. We will now demonstrate how the adversarial game is captured in the design of existing defenses.

We can define each defense algorithm \mathcal{A} as the composition of a training algorithm and a test-time procedure: $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\text{test}} \circ \mathcal{A}_{\text{train}}$. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{train}}$ is a learning algorithm which takes the training dataset D_{train} as an input and outputs a model. Meanwhile $\mathcal{A}_{\text{test}}$ both takes in a model as input and outputs a model. Since all defenses can be considered either training time or test-time defenses (or the combination of both), this formulation models all existing defenses.

Example 1: Adversarial training (Madry et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2019). To model adversarial training, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{train}}$ is the adversarial training algorithm (ie. PGD adversarial training with ℓ_2 attacks of radius 0.5) while $\mathcal{A}_{\text{test}}$ is the identity function. Thus \mathcal{A} just returns the model after adversarial training and this model is evaluated with test-time adversarial examples. The objective of adversarial training is to achieve low robust error which is captured by the last step of the game.

Example 2: Randomized smoothing (Cohen et al., 2019) Randomized smoothing is a test-time defense which adds gaussian noise to the input. We can model this by allowing $\mathcal{A}_{\text{train}}$ to be standard training with training examples augmented with Gaussian noise. Then $\mathcal{A}_{\text{test}}$ can be considered a wrapper function which adds Gaussian noise to the input: $(\mathcal{A}_{\text{test}}(M))(x) = M(x + \epsilon)$ where ϵ is Gaussian noise. The objective of randomized smoothing is to achieve low certified error which can be considered an upper bound on the loss in the last step of the game.