
Large-Scale Dataset Pruning in Adversarial Training through Data Importance Extrapolation

Björn Nieth¹ Thomas Altstidl¹ Leo Schwinn^{*2} Björn Eskofier^{*1}
<https://github.com/BjoernNieth/LS-Dataset-pruning-in-AT>

Abstract

Their vulnerability to small, imperceptible attacks limits the adoption of deep learning models to real-world systems. Adversarial training has proven to be one of the most promising strategies against these attacks, at the expense of a substantial increase in training time. With the ongoing trend of integrating large-scale synthetic data this is only expected to increase even further. Thus, the need for data-centric approaches that reduce the number of training samples while maintaining accuracy and robustness arises. While data pruning and active learning are prominent research topics in deep learning, they are as of now largely unexplored in the adversarial training literature. We address this gap and propose a new data pruning strategy based on extrapolating data importance scores from a small set of data to a larger set. In an empirical evaluation, we demonstrate that extrapolation-based pruning can efficiently reduce dataset size while maintaining robustness.

1. Introduction

Modern deep learning models show impressive capabilities in many different application areas like image classification (He et al., 2015), time-series processing (Nguyen et al., 2021; Dumbach et al., 2023) or natural language processing (Radford et al., 2018). A major limiting factor in deploying these models is their vulnerability to adversarial examples, maliciously crafted perturbations designed to compromise the predictions of a model (Goodfellow et al., 2015; Schwinn et al., 2024). Different defenses were proposed to robustify networks against adversarial examples but the majority of these approaches were later shown to be

ineffective (Croce & Hein, 2020; Schwinn et al., 2023).

One prevailing defense strategy is adversarial training (AT) (Goodfellow et al., 2015; Madry et al., 2019; Xhonneux et al., 2024). AT is a training paradigm where adversarial examples are directly incorporated into a model’s training. Multiple approaches have been employed to increase the performance of adversarial training, like more sophisticated loss functions (Zhang et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2020), increasing model capacity (Madry et al., 2019) or using Stochastic Weight Averaging (SWA) (Izmailov et al., 2019) during training (Gowal et al., 2021b). Recent studies have demonstrated that using large quantities of synthetic data can lead to major robustness improvements (Rebuffi et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023; Altstidl et al., 2023).

Nevertheless, compared to standard training, adversarial training considerably increases the training time (Madry et al., 2019), which is further amplified by using synthetic data (Rebuffi et al., 2021). As a result, the computational costs associated with adversarial training will continue to increase, which provides a challenge for academic research.

We argue that this problem can be tackled from a data-centric perspective. Previous work illustrates the effectiveness of data selection algorithms, such as active learning or data pruning (Coleman et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2023). Yet, these techniques are largely unexplored in adversarial machine learning, and the few existing works do not scale to large datasets (Kaufmann et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023; Dolatabadi et al., 2023).

In this work, we address this problem and propose to extrapolate known data importance scores u_{s_i} from a small set of training examples \mathcal{S} to a larger set of previously unseen training data \mathcal{D} . To this end, we compute the feature embedding of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{D} and calculate data importance scores for unseen samples x_{d_i} as the average of their k -nearest neighbors in \mathcal{S} . As the computational complexity of the extrapolation is independent of the calculation of the data importance score, it allows us to employ accurate but expensive methods to calculate u_{s_i} . We demonstrate the efficiency of this approach using the recently proposed Dynamic Uncertainty (DU) pruning method in the setting of adversarial

^{*}Equal supervision ¹Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg ²Technical University Munich. Correspondence to: Björn Nieth <Bjoern.Nieth@fau.de>.

training. Our contributions are as follows:

- We adopt the data pruning strategy DU to the domain of adversarial training and highlight differences in data importance between adversarial and standard training.
- We propose a scalable method for data pruning by extrapolating a pruning metric from already existing scores to new samples using feature embeddings and k -nearest neighbor.
- An empirical evaluation shows that our extrapolation-based pruning approach scales effectively to adversarial training with large synthetic datasets, achieving greater robustness than other methods with the same amount of data.

1.1. Background

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^C$ denote a differentiable classifier implemented by a neural network, where $C \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of classes. The prediction probability of a class $y \in C$ given input $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for f is denoted as $p_f(y|x, \theta)$, where θ are the parameters of f . During training the parameters are continuously updated for K epochs. We refer to θ_k as the parameters at epoch k . When trained adversarially, the input $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is perturbed to $\tilde{x}_{\theta_k} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ using an adversarial attack $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon, p} : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$, which aims to misclassify the input while keeping $\|x - \tilde{x}_{\theta_k}\|_p < \epsilon$. The maximum magnitude of the perturbation ϵ and the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$ are design parameters of the attack chosen in advance.

In this study, we extend the heuristic data selection method Dynamic Uncertainty (DU), initially described by He et al. (2023), to adversarial training with large datasets. The DU metric is chosen due to its efficiency and minimal impact on model performance. DU quantifies the fluctuating overall uncertainty $u := U(x, y)$ of each sample x with class label y throughout the training process. The authors define the prediction uncertainty at epoch $k = [J, \dots, K]$ over a window of J epochs as

$$P_k(x, y) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} [p_f(y|x, \theta_{k-j}) - \mu_k(x, y)]^2}{J - 1}}, \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_k(x, y) = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} p_f(y|x, \theta_{k-j})}{J}. \quad (2)$$

Then the overall DU is defined as

$$U(x, y) = \frac{\sum_{k=J}^K P_k(x, y)}{K - J}. \quad (3)$$

Intuitively, we can interpret the DU as the average of the prediction uncertainty over a sliding window of size J for K epochs, where the prediction uncertainty is the standard deviation of the confidence in each window.

To adapt DU to adversarial training, we simply exchange x with $\tilde{x}_{\theta_{k-j}}$ for every training sample. Namely, for every input, we first obtain its adversarial perturbed versions and subsequently use them to calculate the prediction uncertainty. In the remainder of this work, we denote the DU score from a standard training model as U . For an adversarial trained model, we refer to the DU score from clean predictions as U_{adv} and from adversarial predictions as \tilde{U}_{adv} , the latter of which uses the perturbed $\tilde{x}_{\theta_{k-j}}$ to compute the score.

2. Extrapolating data importance scores

In our work, we want to employ DU pruning on large-scale synthetic datasets consisting of millions of images. Unfortunately, the calculation of the DU for each sample x requires certainties for each training epoch to be known and hence a network would need to be trained on the whole dataset. This makes it unsuitable for pruning, where the intent is to reduce the number of training images seen by the network during training. We thus devise an extrapolation procedure.

Let $x_{s_i} \in \mathcal{S}$ be the source set for which we compute the DU scores, and $x_{d_i} \in \mathcal{D}$ be the destination set with unknown DU scores with $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$. Then we are interested in extrapolating the DU scores $\{u_{d_i} | i \in 1, \dots, |\mathcal{D}|\}$ from the known $\{u_{s_i} | i \in 1, \dots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$.

We base our extrapolation on a k -nearest neighbor search using an embedding function $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d'}$, which embeds the input into a lower-dimensional space $d' \ll d$. Given the indices j of the k closest embeddings e_{s_j} we then compute the extrapolated score as $u_{d_i} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_j u_{s_j}$. One could use the classifier originally trained on the source set for a straightforward encoding approach to derive the DU scores for extrapolation. We note that this approach could easily be extended to more complex embedding functions, such as foundation models. For more details, see Section 3.

3. Experiment Setup

In the following, we present hyperparameter settings for the conducted experiments.

Dataset. For all of our experiments, we use the CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky, 2009) dataset, which is commonly used for adversarial training and evaluation (Madry et al., 2019; Wong et al., 2020; Schwinn et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023). For the synthetic dataset, we use the 5 million synthetic CIFAR10 images provided by Wang et al. (2023) and subsample them to 2 million samples while keeping the original class balance. Moreover, we sample a subset of 100,000 images from the synthetic dataset as the extrapolation source set \mathcal{S} . To compare our extrapolation approach to the calculation of ground truth DU, we sample a second, mutually exclusive

set of 50,000 images \mathcal{D}_{test} .

Model and training. Our architecture and training procedures are the same as in (Wang et al., 2023). We use a Wide-ResNet-28-10 for all experiments (Zagoruyko & Komodakis, 2017). The model is trained using the TRADES (Zhang et al., 2019) framework with $\beta = 5$ and label smoothing of 0.1. For the optimizer, we use Stochastic Gradient Descent with a Nesterov momentum of 0.9 and a weight decay of 0.0005. We use the super-convergence scheduler from Smith & Topin (2018) with a maximum learning rate of 0.2. On the model parameters, we apply SWA implemented as a decay with a decay rate of 0.995 and a warm-up phase of 2.5% of the total update steps. We use common augmentations consisting of random crops and horizontal flips (He et al., 2015).

Adversarial training. For the generation of the adversarial examples, we use 10 attack iterations in every training step. As in prior work, we conduct experiments using ℓ_∞ -norm untargeted attacks with $\epsilon = 8/255$ and ℓ_2 -norm attacks with $\epsilon = 128/255$ and choose a step size of $2/255$ and $32/255$, respectively.

We deploy a hold-out validation set to select the optimal epoch for our model parameters. To be comparable to Wang et al. (2023), we also select the first 1024 images of the original CIFAR-10 dataset for our validation dataset. We evaluate the robust accuracy of our model using Auto Attack on the test set of CIFAR-10 (Croce & Hein, 2020).

Dynamic uncertainty and data importance extrapolation.

In preliminary experiments on standard CIFAR-10 training, we compared the effectiveness of pruning using forgetting scores (Toneva et al., 2018), Error L2-Norm (EL2N) scores (Paul et al., 2021), and Dynamic Uncertainty (DU) pruning (He et al., 2023). DU performed best in our experiments for low (25%) and high (50%) pruning regimes, and thus, we decided to use it for the remaining experiments.

For the calculation of the DU scores, we use the proposed window size of $J = 10$ from (He et al., 2023).

To extrapolate these data importance scores, we use the following setup. As possible encoding strategies, we deploy the multipurpose visual feature model DINOv2 (Oquab et al., 2024), the contrastive learning deduplication model SSCD (Pizzi et al., 2022), and a ResNet backbone of a CIFAR-10 classifier. All of these models learn an embedding of semantically meaningful features. For the distance metric of the KNN algorithm, we either use cosine similarity or Euclidian distance. The last hyperparameter is the number of neighbors k . In a grid search, we determine the best combination of the hyperparameters for extrapolating data importance scores.

To compute the evaluation metric, we use the subsampled




Figure 1. Mean Absolute Error (MAE) for different data importance extrapolation settings. k denotes the number of nearest neighbors used for extrapolation.




Figure 2. Distribution of adversarial Dynamic Uncertainty (DU) scores vs. standard DU scores.

100,000 synthetic images from \mathcal{S}_{train} and train a classifier for each threat model to obtain the ground truth DU scores of \mathcal{S}_{train} . We further take into account the DU scores obtained from a separate training run on the original images. For the aforementioned grid search, we split 10,000 samples from \mathcal{S}_{train} and used them as the validation set that we extrapolate to. Figure 1 illustrates the mean absolute error (MAE) for various selections of the source dataset \mathcal{S} and different numbers of neighbors k . The results indicate that using only data from the original CIFAR-10 dataset yields poorer extrapolation outcomes compared to using the larger synthetic dataset \mathcal{S}_{train} . The extrapolation can be further improved by merging scores from both the original and synthetic datasets. Results are compared to the unbiased estimator, for which we use the mean DU score of the training samples of \mathcal{S}_{train} .

Exact hyperparameter settings are given in Appendix 4.

Table 1. Comparison of different pruning approaches on the original CIFAR-10 dataset for ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ adversarial training. Either 25% or 50% of the training data is pruned. Training on the full dataset (Baseline) is compared to different dynamic uncertainty scores U , U_{adv} , \tilde{U}_{adv} , and FP. Random pruning is additionally provided as a baseline.

NORM	PRUNED	EXPERIMENT	ROBUST	CLEAN	SPEED	
ℓ_2	0%	BASELINE	72.97%	88.89%	1.00	
		U	71.50%	87.42%	1.33	
		U_{adv}	72.41%	88.59%	2.63	
		\tilde{U}_{adv}	72.81%	88.79%	1.73	
		FP	72.91%	88.86%	2.07	
	25%	RANDOM	67.20%	84.71%	1.87	
		U	62.93%	82.94%	2.48	
		U_{adv}	63.07%	85.47%	2.85	
		\tilde{U}_{adv}	66.93%	86.08%	3.22	
		FP	66.22%	87.19%	1.87	
	50%	RANDOM	64.21%	82.25%	2.14	
		ℓ_∞	0%	BASELINE	54.19%	84.42%
U				50.22%	81.72%	1.55
U_{adv}				50.10%	83.65%	1.53
\tilde{U}_{adv}				52.58%	83.90%	1.55
RANDOM	47.58%			79.22%	2.83	
25%	U		39.47%	76.21%	2.27	
	U_{adv}		33.86%	75.44%	2.18	
	\tilde{U}_{adv}		41.04%	80.19%	2.55	
	FP		44.93%	77.38%	2.96	
	RANDOM		44.93%	77.38%	2.96	

4. Results

This paper aims to enable effective pruning in adversarial training with large datasets by extrapolating data importance scores from existing pruning methods. To this end, we first conduct several experiments to investigate the utility of the DU metric in adversarial training without synthetic data. To evaluate if data importance extrapolation generalizes to other metrics, we further construct our own pruning metric and demonstrate its performance for robust training. Lastly, we evaluate our extrapolation approach on large datasets.

4.1. Dynamic uncertainty analysis

As a preliminary experiment, we investigate the DU metric for adversarial training. Figure 2 highlights differences in the distributions of DU scores between standard and adversarial training. For the standard DU most of the scores are close to zero and the distribution has a relatively long tail compared to the adversarial distribution. The variations in the calculated DU scores point towards differences in the predicted certainties between these two training approaches.

To investigate this further, we compare how the predicted certainties of adversarially and standardly trained samples evolve during training. We analyze samples with a wide range of different DU scores, including very low, average, and high ones. In the upper part of Figure 3, we compare the predicted certainties of different samples from standard and

adversarial training. In standard training, the samples converge to a certainty close to one, and except for the samples with a high DU score, the convergence is very smooth and does not show high oscillations. For adversarial training, there is generally a high level of oscillations present, which in turn will influence the DU.

The DU computes the average over the standard deviation in a sliding windows approach. This can be interpreted as a high-pass filter on the training dynamic, where small window sizes will prevent long-term training trends (e.g., slow convergence) from influencing the DU score. To analyze this further, we compute the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT) of the training dynamics for standard training and ℓ_2 -based adversarial training. In Figure 3, we plot the sum of the magnitude of the lower 1 – 10 (Low) and higher 11 – 150 (High) frequencies of the DFT vs the DU score. It can be seen that for standard training, high frequencies in the training dynamic are more indicative of a high DU score (Pearson R=0.97) compared to low frequencies (R=0.86). This supports our perspective of DU acting as a high-pass filter on the training dynamics. While this trend still holds for ℓ_2 -based adversarial training, lower frequencies are even less correlated with high DU scores in this case.

We propose a simple pruning metric called Frequency Pruning (FP), which considers both short-term trends and long-term training dynamics. In FP we first calculate the DFT from the training dynamics and calculate the data importance scores as the magnitude of the DFT for the respective sample. By considering all frequencies in the training dynamics, the FP captures both global convergence of the predicted certainties and local oscillations. The main purpose of the FP metric is to investigate if other data importance scores beyond DU can be extrapolated for data pruning. Due to the high computational requirements of adversarial training, we constrain FP related experiments to ℓ_2 -based adversarial training.

4.2. Dynamic uncertainty in adversarial training

Before scaling to large datasets, we investigate the effectiveness of DU on a smaller scale. Thus, we adversarially train a model with the configurations described in Section 3 for 300 epochs on the original CIFAR-10 dataset. This experiment is conducted for both ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ threat models. From the training of this model, we store both the clean DU scores U_{adv} and adversarial DU scores \tilde{U}_{adv} for each sample and epoch k . As a reference, we also train a model using standard training and save the clean scores U .

After obtaining the necessary DU scores, we adversarially train a network using the pruned dataset. The resulting performances for both threat models are shown in Table 1. Here, U_{adv} refers to the data importance scores based on the clean certainties obtained from the adversarially trained




Figure 3. The upper two plots show predicted certainties for individual samples during standard training (left) and adversarial training (right). The images below visualize the relationship between the DU of a sample and the mean magnitude of the DFT calculated on the training dynamics of the sample. We distinguish the mean magnitude of the low-frequency spectrum (frequencies 1-10) and the high-frequency spectrum (11-15). R denotes the Pearson correlation between the magnitude and the DU.

Table 2. Evaluation of extrapolated dynamic uncertainty scores on a 2 million sample synthetic CIFAR-10 dataset. 50% of the 2 million synthetic samples are pruned for each method. BALANCED indicates that class balance was maintained during pruning. Results are compared to the same training setup with 1 million images from Wang et al. (2023) and to random pruning.

NORM	EXPERIMENT	ROBUST	CLEAN
ℓ_2	1M (WANG ET AL., 2023)	79.98%	93.76%
	1M RANDOM	80.79%	94.20%
	1M \tilde{U}_{adv}	80.89%	94.37%
	1M \tilde{U}_{adv} BALANCED	81.28%	94.22%
	1M FP	81.00%	94.43%
	1M FP BALANCED	81.38%	94.47%
ℓ_∞	1M (WANG ET AL., 2023)	63.35%	91.12%
	1M RANDOM	63.13%	90.86%
	1M \tilde{U}_{adv}	62.29%	91.22%
	1M \tilde{U}_{adv} BALANCED	63.56%	90.50%

model, \tilde{U}_{adv} refers to the data importance scores based on the adversarial certainties obtained from the adversarially trained model, and U refers to the standard training regime. Additionally, FP refers to the proposed frequency pruning method. As an additional baseline, we include values for a randomly subsampled dataset.

We observe that, DU pruning and FP achieve the highest robustness for the adversarial certainties \tilde{U}_{adv} obtained from adversarial training and hence these will be used in subsequent experiments. When pruning with the DU metric, we can achieve training speed-ups of 1.73 and 1.55 for ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ , respectively, with only minor degradations in robustness. Using the FP metric we can achieve a speed-up of 2.07 for ℓ_2 with only a minor degradation in robustness.

Moreover, we explored the overlap between the samples pruned using the \tilde{U}_{adv} scores and the standard dynamic uncertainty scores U . Both sets contain the most important samples for adversarial and standard training, respectively. For 50% pruning, this is visualized in Figure 4. The different DU scores lead to substantially different pruning behaviors, with only 37% overlap between the two sets. This result indicates considerable differences concerning data importance between the standard and adversarial training settings.




Figure 4. Overlap between the sets pruned by \tilde{U}_{adv} vs. U for 50% pruning on CIFAR-10. Note that only for two thirds of all images they result in the same pruning decision.

4.3. Extrapolation experiments

For our extrapolation approach on large-scale synthetic datasets, we use the optimal hyperparameters from the grid search to extrapolate the data importance scores to a synthetic dataset of 2 million images. Using our extrapolated data importance scores and random subsampling, we train a model using 1 million synthetic images out of 2 million. For the extrapolated pruning approaches, we also run an experiment, where the data importance scores are only compared inside of each class, denoted as class-balanced pruning. Results are compared against the model from Wang et al. (2023) using a similar amount of synthetic data.

From previous work it is known that adversarial training using synthetic data sets does not exhibit robust overfitting (Rebuffi et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023). We compare the robust accuracy achieved by the model for a fixed number of training steps to evaluate the effectiveness of our approach.

We use our extrapolation strategy to estimate the data importance scores for the large-scale synthetic dataset and run the experiments for both threat models. The results are shown in Table 2. For both threat models, our approach beats the baseline from Wang et al. (2023) and the random baseline. Under both threat models, the best pruning approach uses class-balanced pruning. For the ℓ_2 -norm threat model, our introduced FP metric yields the best performing model, having a higher clean and robust accuracy than any other of the trained models.

4.4. Limitations

In the following, we describe relevant limitations of our data pruning approach with respect to how scores are extrapolated and the chosen pruning metric.

Extrapolation model Here, we analyze the performance gap between Ground Truth (GT) DU and our extrapolated

Table 3. Comparison between the utility of extrapolated vs. ground truth dynamic uncertainty values on a dataset of 50 thousand synthetic images \mathcal{D}_{test} . Specifically, when large amounts of data are pruned, ground truth values are superior to extrapolation.

EXPERIMENT	ROBUST	CLEAN
BASELINE ORIGINAL	54.19%	84.42%
BASELINE \mathcal{S}_{train}	56.34%	86.27%
BASELINE \mathcal{D}_{test}	53.32%	83.55%
25% DU-AT-AT	52.26%	81.95%
25% DU-AT-AT-EXTRA.	50.39%	80.86%
25% RANDOM	47.95%	80.43%
50% DU-AT-AT	48.52%	77.67%
50% DU-AT-AT-EXTRA.	42.11%	67.10%
50% RANDOM	45.37%	78.19%

DU scores. We use 50,000 independently sampled synthetic images for this experiment \mathcal{D}_{test} (see Section 3). Figure 5 compares the GT scores from the independent test set with the extrapolated scores. The red line indicates the line of optimal prediction, where the predicted scores exactly match the GT scores. It is evident that the k -nearest neighbor extrapolation model utilized in our experiments is overly simplistic, failing to accurately predict the data importance scores for the samples. Table 3 presents our performance analysis of the data importance scores on the test set. At lower pruning percentages, the extrapolated scores are comparable to the Ground Truth (GT) scores; however, performance deteriorates at higher percentages. Note that calculating the GT scores requires training on the complete dataset, making this approach infeasible in practice. A more sophisticated extrapolation model would likely yield a more accurate estimate of these scores, enhancing the performance of the downstream models.

Pruning metric In our experiments, we primarily used the DU metric to assess data importance. Additionally, we introduced a new metric, FP, based on the frequency spectrum of training dynamics. Despite its simplicity, FP performed remarkably well. While the performance of models trained with either data importance metric is comparable, our experiments show that they consider different samples for pruning, with little overlap between the pruned sets. This suggests that further research into heuristic pruning approaches is necessary, as the attribution of each data sample to the model performance remains largely unknown.

A promising approach may include extrapolating data attribution metrics, which provide deeper insights into data importance but demand significant computational resources (Ilyas et al., 2022). Extrapolation could potentially lower these computational demands while preserving the advantages of data attribution.




Figure 5. Extrapolated Dynamic Uncertainty (DU) score distribution compared to ground truth DU score distribution. Extrapolated scores are biased toward the mean of the ground truth distribution.

Performance Evaluation Due to the considerable cost of adversarial training, we compared our approach using a relatively small model and large synthetic dataset. Scaling to larger datasets, such as ImageNet, was out of the scope of this work and we leave it to future research.

5. Related Work

Adversarial Training In the seminal work of Szegedy et al. (2014), the authors discovered the vulnerability of deep learning models against adversarial examples. Adversarial training (AT) was one of the first defenses proposed against these attacks (Goodfellow et al., 2015) and further enhanced in Madry et al. (2019). Later work proposed more sophisticated loss functions for adversarial training, like TRADES (Zhang et al., 2019) or MARTS (Wang et al., 2020). Other techniques like increasing model capacity (Madry et al., 2019) or SWA (Gowal et al., 2021b) are employed to increase the robustness of a model. Data augmentation is a debated topic in adversarial training, with different works pointing in different directions (Carmon et al., 2022; Rice et al., 2020; Gowal et al., 2021a; Rebuffi et al., 2021; Li & Spratling, 2023; Wang et al., 2023).

Schmidt et al. (2018) illustrate, that adversarial generalization needs more data than standard training from a theoretical viewpoint. In line with this observation, later work demonstrated that the adversarial robustness can be increased through additional unlabeled data (Carmon et al., 2022; Gowal et al., 2021a). In recent work, generative models were employed, to produce additional synthetic samples, which has resulted in state-of-the-art performance for robust models (Rebuffi et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023). Yet, this trend has resulted in considerably increased training times.

Data Selection in Adversarial Training The work on data selection in adversarial training is sparse. In general, three different categories of data selection in robust training are available. The first strategy involves dynamically deciding during training for which samples, the adversarial perturbations should be applied and which samples are used without perturbation (Hua et al., 2021; Chen & Lee, 2024). The second line of work includes corset selection strategies applied to adversarial training (Killamsetty et al., 2021a; Dolatabadi et al., 2023). The last line of work consists of heuristic data pruning in adversarial training (Kaufmann et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023).

For the first category, the most influential work is BulletTrain (Hua et al., 2021). In BulletTrain, only a full perturbation is calculated for samples close to the decision boundary of the model. This selection is done dynamically during the training and can considerably speed up the training without losing performance. In Chen & Lee (2024) the authors calculate a few iterations of the adversarial perturbation and only continue the calculation if the loss for the sample is increasing. In Gupta & Narayan (2023) the authors only calculate the adversarial examples for samples that are not robust. These samples are selected through an efficient but weak attack on the training data. However, these works do not directly address the problem of increasingly large datasets. Moreover, Gupta & Narayan (2023) did not use a modern adversarial training setup or a standardized test for adversarial performance evaluation. Therefore the impact of their work is hard to estimate.

The only work surrounding adversarial core set selection evolves around the adaptation of the GRAD-MATCH (Killamsetty et al., 2021a) algorithm to the domain of adversarial training. Both Dolatabadi et al. (2023) and Li et al. (2023) give an adversarial adaptation of GRAD-MATCH. Both approaches speed up the training time, but also substantially decrease the resulting model’s performance. In Xu et al. (2023), the authors deploy a core set selection algorithm to the related field of adversarial contrastive learning. Still, due to the high computational complexity of coresets selection, these approaches do not efficiently scale to large datasets.

Closer to this work, Adv-GLISTER (Li et al., 2023) adapts the GLISTER (Killamsetty et al., 2021b) algorithm for adversarial training. Adv-GLISTER speeds up the training time but considerably reduces the performance of the model. The most comparable work to this paper is Kaufmann et al. (2022). Here, the authors test different data-pruning strategies for robust training. After a fixed number of epochs, a certain amount of data is dropped according to a data selection strategy. However, while this approach decreases the training time, it also decreases accuracy and robustness.

6. Conclusion

We propose a novel method to scale data pruning for large datasets, enabling adversarial training with extensive synthetic data. Our approach shows that data importance can be extrapolated from small to large datasets, circumventing the need for expensive pruning methods on the entire dataset. We demonstrate the effectiveness of applying our extrapolation method to DU in adversarial training contexts. Additionally, we compare samples pruned for standard and adversarial training, revealing significant differences in data importance. Our experiments underscore the potential of extrapolating computationally intensive scores to unseen data, paving the way for future exploration of more complex metrics like data attribution scores.

7. Acknowledgement

We thank Gauthier Gidel and David Dobre for their assistance and feedback. Leo Schwinn gratefully acknowledges funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - Projectnumber 544579844.

References

- Altstidl, T., Dobre, D., Eskofier, B., Gidel, G., and Schwinn, L. Raising the Bar for Certified Adversarial Robustness with Diffusion Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10388*, 2023.
- Carmon, Y., Raghunathan, A., Schmidt, L., Liang, P., and Duchi, J. C. Unlabeled data improves adversarial robustness. *NeurIPS 2019*, 2022.
- Chen, E.-C. and Lee, C.-R. Data filtering for efficient adversarial training. *Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- Coleman, C., Yeh, C., Mussmann, S., Mirzasoleiman, B., Bailis, P., Liang, P., Leskovec, J., and Zaharia, M. Selection via proxy: Efficient data selection for deep learning. *ICLR 2020*, 2020.
- Croce, F. and Hein, M. Reliable evaluation of adversarial robustness with an ensemble of diverse parameter-free attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01690*, 2020.
- Dolatabadi, H. M., Erfani, S., and Leckie, C. Adversarial coreset selection for efficient robust training. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2023.
- Dumbach, P., Schwinn, L., Löhr, T., Elsberger, T., and Eskofier, B. M. Artificial intelligence trend analysis in german business and politics: a web mining approach. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, pp. 1–22, 2023.
- Goodfellow, I. J., Shlens, J., and Szegedy, C. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *ICLR 2015*, 2015.
- Gowal, S., Qin, C., Uesato, J., Mann, T., and Kohli, P. Uncovering the limits of adversarial training against norm-bounded adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03593*, 2021a.
- Gowal, S., Rebuffi, S.-A., Wiles, O., Stimberg, F., Calian, D. A., and Mann, T. Improving robustness using generated data. *NeurIPS 2021*, 2021b.
- Gupta, V. and Narayan, A. Do we need entire training data for adversarial training? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06241*, 2023.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03385*, 2015.
- He, M., Yang, S., Huang, T., and Zhao, B. Large-scale dataset pruning with dynamic uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05175*, 2023.
- Hua, W., Zhang, Y., Guo, C., Zhang, Z., and Suh, G. E. BulletTrain: Accelerating robust neural network training via boundary example mining. *NeurIPS 2021*, 2021.
- Ilyas, A., Park, S. M., Engstrom, L., Leclerc, G., and Madry, A. Datamodels: Predicting predictions from training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00622*, 2022.
- Izmailov, P., Podoprikin, D., Garipov, T., Vetrov, D., and Wilson, A. G. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05407*, 2019.
- Kaufmann, M., Zhao, Y., Shumailov, I., Mullins, R., and Papernot, N. Efficient adversarial training with data pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00694*, 2022.
- Killamsetty, K., Sivasubramanian, D., Ramakrishnan, G., De, A., and Iyer, R. GRAD-MATCH: Gradient matching based data subset selection for efficient deep model training. *PMLR*, 2021a.
- Killamsetty, K., Sivasubramanian, D., Ramakrishnan, G., and Iyer, R. GLISTER: Generalization based data subset selection for efficient and robust learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.10630*, 2021b.
- Krizhevsky, A. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *University of Toronto*, 2009.
- Li, L. and Spratling, M. Data augmentation alone can improve adversarial training. *ICLR 2023*, 2023.
- Li, Y., Zhao, P., Lin, X., Kailkhura, B., and Goldhahn, R. Less is more: Data pruning for faster adversarial training. *CEUR WS 2023*, 2023.

- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., and Vladu, A. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. *ICLR 2018*, 2019.
- Nguyen, A., Chatterjee, S., Weinzierl, S., Schwinn, L., Matzner, M., and Eskofier, B. Time matters: Time-aware lstms for predictive business process monitoring. In Lee-mans, S. and Leopold, H. (eds.), *Process Mining Workshops*, pp. 112–123, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-72693-5.
- Oquab, M., Darcet, T., Moutakanni, T., Vo, H., Szafraniec, M., Khalidov, V., Fernandez, P., Haziza, D., Massa, F., El-Nouby, A., Assran, M., Ballas, N., Galuba, W., Howes, R., Huang, P.-Y., Li, S.-W., Misra, I., Rabbat, M., Sharma, V., Synnaeve, G., Xu, H., Jegou, H., Mairal, J., Labatut, P., Joulin, A., and Bojanowski, P. DINOv2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *TMLR 2024*, 2024.
- Paul, M., Ganguli, S., and Dziugaite, G. K. Deep learning on a data diet: Finding important examples early in training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 20596–20607, 2021.
- Peng, S., Xu, W., Cornelius, C., Hull, M., Li, K., Duggal, R., Phute, M., Martin, J., and Chau, D. H. Robust principles: Architectural design principles for adversarially robust CNNs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16258*, 2023.
- Pizzi, E., Roy, S. D., Ravindra, S. N., Goyal, P., and Douze, M. A self-supervised descriptor for image copy detection. *CVPR 2022*, 2022.
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., and Sutskever, I. Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training. 2018.
- Rebuffi, S.-A., Goyal, S., Calian, D. A., Stimberg, F., Wiles, O., and Mann, T. Fixing data augmentation to improve adversarial robustness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01946*, 2021.
- Rice, L., Wong, E., and Kolter, J. Z. Overfitting in adversarially robust deep learning. *PMLR 2020*, 2020.
- Schmidt, L., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Talwar, K., and Madry, A. Adversarially robust generalization requires more data. *NeurIPS2028*, 2018.
- Schwinn, L., Nguyen, A., Raab, R., Zanca, D., Eskofier, B. M., Tenbrinck, D., and Burger, M. Dynamically sampled nonlocal gradients for stronger adversarial attacks. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2021.
- Schwinn, L., Dobre, D., Günnemann, S., and Gidel, G. Adversarial attacks and defenses in large language models: Old and new threats. In *NeurIPS 2023, ICBINB Workshop (Spotlight with Oral presentation)*, 2023.
- Schwinn, L., Dobre, D., Xhonneux, S., Gidel, G., and Günnemann, S. Soft prompt threats: Attacking safety alignment and unlearning in open-source llms through the embedding space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09063*, 2024.
- Smith, L. N. and Topin, N. Super-convergence: Very fast training of neural networks using large learning rates. *ICLR 2018*, 2018.
- Szegedy, C., Zaremba, W., Sutskever, I., Bruna, J., Erhan, D., Goodfellow, I., and Fergus, R. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2014.
- Toneva, M., Sordoni, A., Combes, R. T. d., Trischler, A., Bengio, Y., and Gordon, G. J. An empirical study of example forgetting during deep neural network learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.05159*, 2018.
- Wang, Y., Zou, D., Yi, J., Bailey, J., Ma, X., and Gu, Q. Improving Adversarial Robustness Requires Revisiting Misclassified Examples. *ICLR 2020*, 2020.
- Wang, Z., Pang, T., Du, C., Lin, M., Liu, W., and Yan, S. Better diffusion models further improve adversarial training. *PMLR 2023*, 2023.
- Wong, E., Rice, L., and Kolter, J. Z. Fast is better than free: Revisiting adversarial training. *ICLR 2020*, 2020.
- Xhonneux, S., Sordoni, A., Günnemann, S., Gidel, G., and Schwinn, L. Efficient adversarial training in llms with continuous attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15589*, 2024.
- Xu, X., Zhang, J., Liu, F., Sugiyama, M., and Kankanhalli, M. Efficient adversarial contrastive learning via robustness-aware coreset selection. *NeurIPS 2023*, 2023.
- Yang, S., Xie, Z., Peng, H., Xu, M., Sun, M., and Li, P. Dataset Pruning: Reducing Training Data by Examining Generalization Influence. *ICLR 2023*, 2023.
- Zagoruyko, S. and Komodakis, N. Wide residual networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07146*, 2017.
- Zhang, H., Yu, Y., Jiao, J., Xing, E. P., Ghaoui, L. E., and Jordan, M. I. Theoretically principled trade-off between robustness and accuracy. *PMLR 2019*, 2019.

A. Extrapolation Hyperparameters

The set of hyperparameter settings for the extrapolation of the data importance scores depends on the data importance metric and the attack type. The configuration used for our experiments is shown in 4. For all experiments, selecting the source dataset as the combination of S_{train} and the original CIFAR-10 dataset yielded the best results. In our tested settings, the DINOv2 model is never used as the encoding strategy.

Table 4. Hyperparameters selected for different configurations of the data importance extrapolation.

ATTACK	SCORE	K	ENCODING	DISTANCE METRIC	TRAINING DATA
L_∞	DU	13	SSCD	COSINE SIM.	NORMAL+SYNTH.
	FP	12	SSCD	EUCLIDEAN DIST.	
ℓ_2	DU	35	RESNET50	COSINE SIM.	NORMAL+SYNTH.
	FP	24	SSCD	EUCLIDEAN DIST.	