

DART: Deep Adversarial Automated Red Teaming for LLM Safety

Warning: this paper contains content that may be offensive or upsetting.

Bojian Jiang^{1,2}, Yi Jing^{2†}, Tianhao Shen¹, Qing Yang^{2*}, Deyi Xiong^{1*}

¹College of Intelligence and Computing, Tianjin University, Tianjin, China

²Du Xiaoman Finance, Beijing, China

{jiangbojian, thshen, dyxiong}@tju.edu.cn

{jingyi, yangqing}@duxiaoman.com

Abstract

Manual Red teaming is a commonly-used method to identify vulnerabilities in large language models (LLMs), which is costly and unscalable. In contrast, automated red teaming uses a Red LLM to automatically generate adversarial prompts to the Target LLM, offering a scalable way for safety vulnerability detection. However, the difficulty of building a powerful automated Red LLM lies in the fact that the safety vulnerabilities of the Target LLM are dynamically changing with the evolution of the Target LLM. To mitigate this issue, we propose a Deep Adversarial Automated Red Teaming (DART) framework in which the Red LLM and Target LLM are deeply and dynamically interacting with each other in an iterative manner. In each iteration, in order to generate successful attacks as many as possible, the Red LLM not only takes into account the responses from the Target LLM, but also adversarially adjust its attacking directions by monitoring the global diversity of generated attacks across multiple iterations. Simultaneously, to explore dynamically changing safety vulnerabilities of the Target LLM, we allow the Target LLM to enhance its safety via an active learning based data selection mechanism. Experimental results demonstrate that DART significantly reduces the safety risk of the target LLM. For human evaluation on Anthropic Harmless dataset, compared to the instruction-tuning target LLM, DART eliminates the violation risks by 53.4%. We will release the datasets and codes of DART soon.

challenges, e.g., yielding harmful outputs and behaviors (Mehrotra et al., 2024; Hong et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024), suffering from malicious use (Charan et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024). To improve the safety of LLMs, it is necessary to discover and fix vulnerabilities in LLMs before deployment. Red teaming is a commonly-used method to uncover vulnerabilities. As a typical red teaming effort for LLMs, manual red teaming (Bai et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023) requires human annotators to carefully design adversarial prompts in a brute-force manner (Touvron et al., 2023), which is plagued by low scalability due to its high cost.

In contrast, automated red teaming is promising in scalability and has recently received increasing attention due to its powerful ability to automatically generate adversarial prompts. Currently, two prominent directions for automated red teaming are explored: jailbreaking and Red LLM training. The essence of jailbreaking is to transform normal prompts to jailbreaking prompts, usually via token-level and sentence-level prompt modification. Token-level methods (Wallace et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2023; Jones et al., 2023) adopt a process of optimizing nonsensical but aggressive combinations of tokens used to be as prefixes or suffixes of the original prompt. Sentence-level methods (Wu et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024) aim to automatically design natural language templates with definite semantics similar to human writing. Another line of research (Chao et al., 2023; Mehrotra et al., 2024), Red LLM training is to train a parametrized Red LLM to transform input instructions to adversarial instructions.

In this paper, our key interest lies in the second research line, i.e., Red LLM exploration. One challenge with Red LLMs is that the safety vulnerabilities of the Target LLM are dynamically changing with the evolution of the Target LLM, making it difficult to build a powerful Red LLM. To mitigate this issue, we propose a Deep Adversarial Auto-

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have exhibited remarkable capabilities across many tasks and languages (Achiam et al., 2023; Anthropic, 2024). Despite the prowess of LLMs, they suffer from safety

*Corresponding authors.

†Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Illustration of DART. The Red LLM and Target LLM interact with each other in an iterative manner. The goal of the Red LLM is to transform prompts to jailbreaking prompts. The Target LLM dedicates to generating safe and helpful responses to resist the attacks from the Red LLM. Two reward models (RMs, safety reward model and helpfulness reward model) and a diversity evaluator provide a basis to select new training samples for the Red LLM and Target LLM. The Red LLM selects unsafe and globally diverse samples as new training data for the next iteration. simultaneously, the target LLM prioritizes to select difficult samples as new training samples for the next iteration.

mated Red Teaming framework (DART), in which the Red LLM and Target LLM are deeply and dynamically interacting with each other in an iterative manner. As illustrated in Figure 1, the Red LLM not only takes into account the responses from the Target LLM, but also adjust its attacking directions by monitoring the global diversity of generated attacks cross multiple iterations. The Target LLM adopts an active learning based method to improve its safety and exposes new dynamically changing safety vulnerabilities to the Red LLM.

We evaluate DART on our in-house safety dataset and Anthropic Harmless (Ganguli et al., 2022) dataset. DART enhances the safety of the target LLM significantly without compromising its usefulness. For human evaluation on the Anthropic Harmless dataset, compared to Vanilla (instruction-tuning target LLM), DART eliminates violation risks by 53.4%. We also re-implement a related framework MART (Ge et al., 2023), which eliminates the violation risks by 41.7%. By contrast, DART with global diversity and active learning significantly improves the safety of the target LLMs.

Main contributions in this paper are summarized as follows:

- We propose DART, a new and efficient automated red teaming framework in which the Red LLM and target LLM adopt a interact manner to detect the dynamical safety vulnerabilities and fix them.
- With multi-round adversarial training, DART significantly reduces the safety risks of the target LLM.
- We will release the datasets and codes of DART, providing researchers with an open-source framework of iterative automated red teaming after paper reviewing.

2 Related Work

Manual/Automated Red Teaming Manual red teaming is an effective but unscalable process to detect safety vulnerabilities of the Target LLM. For example, to improve the safety of Llama2 chat models (Touvron et al., 2023), Meta has established a human red team consisting of 350 persons who come from different job positions. They manually create attack samples for multiple domains, including human trafficking, racial discrimination, pri-

Algorithm 1: DART Training Framework

Input: Initial Red LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^0$, initial Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$, safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s , helpfulness reward model \mathcal{R}_h , diversity evaluator \mathcal{E}_d , attacking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}$, initial Red LLM training set $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^0$, initial Target LLM training set $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^0$, maximum number of newly generated K_{max} , attack frequency A_{max}

Output: Red LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^T$, Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^T$

```
1 for  $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  do
2    $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}, K_{\text{max}})$ 
3    $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i \leftarrow \{\}$ 
4   for  $j \in \{1, \dots, A_{\text{max}}\}$  do
5      $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^{ij} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^{i-1}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, K_{\text{max}})$ 
6      $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i = \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i \cup \{\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^{ij}\}$ 
7    $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \text{SelectBlue}(\mathcal{R}_s, \mathcal{R}_h, \mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i, K_{\text{max}})$ 
8      $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \leftarrow \text{SelectRed}(\mathcal{R}_s, \mathcal{E}_d, \mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^i, \mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^{i1}, \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}, K_{\text{max}})$ 
9    $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \cup \mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^{i-1}$ 
10   $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \cup \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$ 
11   $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}(\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i)$ 
12   $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^{i-1}(\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i)$ 
13 return  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^T, \mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^T$ 
```

vacy violations and so on. Multiple rounds of testing last for several months. Anthropic researchers have recruited a large number of manual workers to extract harmful responses from LLMs and collect a red teaming dataset (Bai et al., 2022). In contrast, automated red teaming (Chao et al., 2023; Ge et al., 2023; Mehrotra et al., 2024) has received increasing attention due to its scalable ability to efficiently and automatically generate attacks. Jailbreaking and Red LLM training are the two prominent directions in automated red teaming.

Jailbreaking The goal of jailbreaking is to transform the input prompts to jailbreaking prompts that can trigger the target LLM to yield unsafe responses, usually via token- and sentence-level prompt modification. Token-level jailbreaking methods optimize to design a nonsensical template to force instruction following. For Example, AutoPrompt (Shin et al., 2020) and UAT (Wallace et al., 2021) optimize universal adversarial triggers to jailbreak the target LLM. To further improve AutoPrompt, GCG (Zou et al., 2023) proposes a multiple-prompt and model based method to explore transferable triggers from black-box LLMs. ARCA (Jones et al., 2023) adopts a discrete optimization algorithm to search a jailbreaking prompt. AutoDAN (Zhu et al., 2023) incorporates a fluency objective to produce more sensical templates. Since nonsensical prompts are easy to be detected by the

Target LLM (Alon and Kamfonas, 2023), sentence-level methods aim to disguise prompts to deceive the defense of the target LLM. Wu et al. (2023) and Liu et al. (2024) utilize systematic evolution-based algorithms (Guo et al., 2024) to generate adversarial natural language instructions.

Red LLM Training Jailbreaking creates effective jailbreaks only by extending prompts by additional prefixes or suffixes. Another line of work is to train the Red LLM to flexibly modify the input prompts to jailbreaking the target LLM. PAIR (Chao et al., 2023) utilizes in-context learning methods to generate improved prompts iteratively. TAP (Mehrotra et al., 2024) adopts tree-of-thought technique to generate adversarial prompts. The most related to our work is MART (Ge et al., 2023), which adopts a multi-round adversarial training process to improve the efficiency of the Red LLM, while also enhances the safety of the target LLM.

3 DART

The entire framework is illustrated in Figure 1. We elaborate this framework in this section. Particularly, we first introduce how the Red LLM and Target LLM iterative with each other in the multi-around framework. Second, we describe the working process of various components in DART, including LLMs (the Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} and the Target

Algorithm 2: SelectRed Function

Input: attacking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^i$,
jailbreaking prompts set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$,
jailbreaking response set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$,
safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s , diversity
evaluator \mathcal{E}_d , Red LLM training set
 $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$, maximum number of
newly generated K_{max}

Parameter: safety threshold θ_{red}^s and
diversity threshold θ_{red}^d

Output: harmful and diverse Red LLM
training set $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$

```
1  $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i = \{\}$ 
2 for  $(a, p, d) \in (\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^i, \mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i)$  do
3    $s^s \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_s(p, d)$ 
4    $s^d \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_d(p, \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^{i-1})$ 
5   if  $s^s < \theta_{\text{red}}^s \wedge s^d < \theta_{\text{red}}^d$  then
6      $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \cup \{(a, p)\}$ 
7     if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i) > K_{\text{max}}$  then
8       Break
9 return  $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$ 
```

LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$), reward models (RWs, safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s and helpfulness reward model \mathcal{R}_h) and diversity evaluator \mathcal{E}_d .

3.1 Iterative Adversarial Training

In DART, the Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} and the Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ interplay with each other iteratively. The process of each iteration is repeated as illustrated in Algorithms 1. The main steps can be described as follows:

- 1) The Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} transforms attacking dataset $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}$ to \mathcal{P}_{gen} .
- 2) The Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ takes \mathcal{P}_{gen} as input and yield responses as \mathcal{D}_{gen} .
- 3) The Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} selects new training samples considering feedback from the Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ and the diversity evaluator. The Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ selects new training samples based on active learning.
- 4) The Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} and the Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ update themselves independently using new training set for the next round.

3.2 Components in DART Framework

Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} We initialize parameterized $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^0$ with our manually constructed instruction

Algorithm 3: SelectBlue Function

Input: jailbreaking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$,
multiple jailbreaking response sets
 $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$, safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s ,
helpfulness reward model \mathcal{R}_h ,
maximum number of newly
generated K_{max}

Parameter: safety threshold θ_{target}^s and
helpfulness threshold θ_{target}^h

Output: safe and helpful target LLM
response set $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i$

```
1  $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \{\}$ 
2 for  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^{ij} \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$  do
3    $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{sample}} \leftarrow \{\}$ 
4   for  $(p, d) \in (\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^{ij})$  do
5      $s^s \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_s(p, d)$ 
6      $s^h \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_h(p, d)$ 
7     if  $s^s > \theta_{\text{target}}^s \wedge s^h > \theta_{\text{target}}^h$  then
8        $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{sample}} \leftarrow$   
         $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{sample}} \cup \{(p, d)\}$ 
9   if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{SH}_{\text{sample}}) = 1$  then
10     $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \cup \mathcal{SH}_{\text{sample}}$ 
11    if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i) > K_{\text{max}}$  then
12      Break
13 return  $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i$ 
```

dataset $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^0$ that consists of input prompts and corresponding jailbreaking prompts. In the attacking process of round i , the goal of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$ is to transform $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}$ to a jailbreaking set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$, then trigger the target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$ to yield unsafe responses. $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$ is selected by a carefully designed data selection algorithm, then used to train $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i$ for the next round.

Target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ We also initialize a parameterized $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ with an instruction dataset $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{blue}}^0$ that consists of input prompts and corresponding responses. In the defending process of round i , $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^{i-1}$ strives to resist the jailbreaking set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$ generated by $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$ and yield responses as $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$. Finally, DART adopts a safe and helpful training dataset $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i$ based on active learning to train $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$.

Reward Models DART adopts two reward models to score a pair (prompt, response) to produce a confidence score. Due to the trade-off relationship between safety and helpfulness (Bai et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023), we employ a safety re-

ward model \mathcal{R}_s and a helpfulness reward model \mathcal{R}_h to guide the iterative adversarial training process. The termination condition of adversarial training process is when $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$ begins to decay in helpfulness score compared with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$.

Diversity Evaluator Diversity Evaluator \mathcal{E}_d is to calculate a global diversity score between a candidate pair (a, p) and training set $\mathcal{H}D_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$. Specially, \mathcal{E}_d computes a BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) between p and the target side of instance in the Red LLM training set $\mathcal{H}D_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$, then takes the averaged BLEU score as the diversity score.

3.3 Adversarial Attack with Global Diversity

Recent studies (Mehrabi et al., 2023; Hong et al., 2024) have demonstrated that generating diverse prompts is more likely to effectively attack the Target LLMs. During the adversarial training process, DART not only takes into account the responses from the Target LLM, but also adversarially adjust its attacking directions by monitoring the global diversity of generated attacks across multiple iterations. Compared to MART (Ge et al., 2023), we set up an additional barrier for $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^{i-1}$ to accumulate samples using a diversity evaluator \mathcal{E}_d . As illustrated in Algorithms 2, DART only select a new (p, g) whose diversity score s^d is lower than diversity threshold θ_{red}^d and safety score s^s smaller than safety threshold θ_{red}^s . In doing so, we can have training set $\mathcal{H}D_{\text{red}}^i$ for next round i , where instances are unsafe and diverse.

3.4 Target LLM Data Selection based on Active Learning

In DART, inspired by active learning (Settles, 2009), we assume that a sample is valuable if it is hard to defend. In Algorithms 1 and Algorithms 3, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^{i-1}$ generates \mathcal{A}_{max} responses but only selects the pair (p, d) defended successfully only once as a new sample to be added. By adopting data selection function **SelectBlue** based on active learning, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ improves its safety and exposes new dynamically changing safety vulnerabilities to \mathcal{M}_{red} .

4 Experiments

We conducted extensive experiments to examine the proposed automated red teaming framework against strong baselines with both automatic and human evaluation. For our experiments, we also constructed a series of datasets, including

the seed instruction datasets for initial adversarial LLMs ($\mathcal{H}D_{\text{red}}^0, \mathcal{S}\mathcal{H}_{\text{target}}^0$), the attacking dataset $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}$ and the evaluation datasets (safety and helpfulness).

4.1 Data and Models

Seed Instruction Training Data In order to construct an initialized dataset for the Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} to learn the task of prompt rewriting, we designed a pipeline which dynamically detects toxic prompts and transforms them to the corresponding adversarial prompts. First, we built a dataset named *CulturaXEvil* with a high concentration on malicious English data. We adopted HateBERT (Caselli et al., 2021) as a toxic detector to filter out malicious data from *CulturaX* (Nguyen et al., 2023) with unsafety scores greater than a threshold 0.95. Second, we used Google Translation Engine to translate a part of *CulturaXEvil* to Chinese, and subsequently back-translated to English with Baidu Translation Engine. To eliminate the quality loss in dual MT process, we manually removed sentence pairs which are not semantically equivalent to each other. As a result, we curated $\mathcal{H}D_{\text{red}}^0$ with 960 prompts rewriting pairs to initialize (SFT) the Red LLM.

The instruction dataset $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{H}_{\text{target}}^0$, which is used to initialize the target LLM, consisting of LIMA (Zhou et al., 2023), Open Assistant (Köpf et al., 2023) and an in-house instruction dataset. The process of constructing the in-house dataset is as follows: we extract a portion of *CulturaXEvil* and send them to GPT-4 for safety check. Only safety responses are retained.

In-Domain and Out-Domain Evaluation Sets

We evaluated the safety and helpfulness of the target LLM in different iterations. To observe the degree of convergence in the adversarial training process, we extracted 452 samples from *CulturaXEvil* as **InDomainSafe**. We also constructed a dataset with the same distribution as $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{H}_{\text{target}}^0$, named **InDomainHelp** which contains 997 samples. In order to observe whether the universal capabilities of LLMs decreases in the adversarial training process, we uses Anthropic Harmless (Bai et al., 2022) and AlpacaEval (Li et al., 2023) as our out-domain datasets.

Attacking Data We have extracted 225263 samples from *CulturaXEvil* as attacking data $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}$ which is used to be transformed to jailbreaking prompts to attack the target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$.




Figure 2: Automatical evaluation by reward models on the in-domain and out-domain datasets. The trend of curves is presented with various percentile thresholds (20%, 40%, 60%, 80%).

Target LLM	Violation Rate	
	RM	Human
Vanilla	18.9%	34.3%
Baseline (Ge et al., 2023)†	14.4%	20%
DART (ours)	11.6%	16%

Table 1: Violation rate on Anthropic Harmless datasets by automatic evaluation and human evaluation. Models with † denote the re-implementing results by our codes.

Reward Models For the safety reward model, we used the Llama-2-7b-hf (Touvron et al., 2023) to initialize \mathcal{R}_s , then trained it with DeepSpeed-Chat (Yao et al., 2023) framework directly on the open-source Anthropic Harmless trainset (Bai et al., 2022). However, in our preliminary experiments, we discovered that the reward score of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$ was not credible due to a large amount of noisy data in the training set. To address this issue, we manually re-annotated a part of training data in Anthropic Harmless. For the helpfulness reward model, we directly adopted UltraLM-13B (Cui et al., 2023) as our \mathcal{R}_h due to its relatively stable performance compared to other open-source models of the same period.

Adversarial LLMs We used Llama-2-7b-hf (Touvron et al., 2023) as the starting checkpoint to train the Red LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^0$ and the target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$ on the instruction datasets $\mathcal{H}D_{\text{red}}^0$ and $\mathcal{S}H_{\text{target}}^0$ respectively. During each iteration i of the adversarial training process, \mathcal{M}_{red} and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ reload checkpoints from the preceding iteration $i - 1$.

4.2 Baseline and Setup

Baseline Automated red teaming with a dynamical adversarial training process is a novel frame-

work. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first attempt in this direction. The most related work to DART is MART (Ge et al., 2023), which is significantly different from DART in new training data selection. We reimplemented it as our baseline. As illustrated in Algorithms 4 and 5, MART selects new training data for adversarial LLMs only through multiple thresholds. Compared with MART, in Algorithms 2 and Algorithms 3, additional thresholds are implemented to ensure global diversity and achieve active learning. Table 2 displays a list of parameters.

Automatical Evaluation for the Target LLMs

The objective of dynamical adversarial red teaming is to improve the safety of the target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ without compromising its helpfulness, particularly on out-of-domain data. We provide the trends of reward changes under four different cut-off values (20%, 40%, 60%, 80%) in Figure 2. Cut-off 20% means to calculate the average score of the samples with the lowest 20%. As illustrated in 2, under the premise of stable helpfulness trends, the safety trend increases steadily with the number of adversarial rounds both on the in-domain and out-domain dataset. The safety score of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$ consistently exceeds that of the baseline (MART).

Human Evaluation for the Target LLM

To check consistency between human and automatic evaluation, we synchronously conducted human evaluation on Anthropic Harmless testset (Gan-guli et al., 2022). As displayed in Table 1, DART demonstrates a lower violation rate compared to Vanilla and MART in both automatic and human evaluations. For human evaluation on the Anthropic Harmless dataset, compared to Vanilla




Figure 3: Illustrating the contributions of global diversity and active learning in DART and explore whether they can be combined to further enhance effectiveness of adversarial training process.

(instruction-tuning target LLM), MART eliminates the violation risks by 41.7% While DART eliminates the violation risks by 53.4%.

5 Ablation Studies and Analysis

5.1 Overlap Test on Global Diversity and Active Learning

DART improves the effectiveness of adversarial training framework by optimizing the process of selecting new training data by two algorithms: global diversity and active learning. In order to analyze the contributions of the two algorithms in DART, we separately added global diversity and active learning to the baseline. As illustrated in Figure 3, both global diversity and active learning can respectively improve the safety of the target LLMs. DART further improves the safety of LLMs by combining both of them.

5.2 Necessity of Adversarial Training Dynamically

We speculate that there are two advantages of the proposed dynamical adversarial framework. In each iteration i , the Red LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i$ adjusts its attacking direction based on the feed-back from the target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$. Similarly, the target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$ also iteratively improves its safety and exposes new dynamically changing safety vulnerabilities to the Red LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i$. In order to further explore the necessity of dynamical adversarial training for \mathcal{M}_{red} and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}$, we only adopted fixed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^0$ or $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$ to select new training data in iteration i . As illustrated in Figure 4, it is necessary to adopt the latest states $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^i$ for adversarial training.

5.3 Diverse vs. Aggressive for Red LLMs

Current researches have demonstrated that diverse attacking prompts are very important to automated red teaming (Hong et al., 2024; Mehrabi et al., 2023). We hence designed experiments to compare the effectiveness of two types of Red LLMs: one with diverse attacking prompts and the other with aggressive attacking prompts. The first Red LLM is constructed with global diversity algorithm used in DART. As illustrated in Algorithm 6, the second Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{agg} multiply attacks the target LLM using attacking prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}$ and jailbreaking prompt \mathcal{P}_{gen} respectively, then selects samples $(a, p) \in (\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}, \mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}})$ with an averaged safety score difference greater than θ_{red}^g . We additionally built a dataset *IndomainSafeRed* which extracts 452 samples from *CulturaXEvil*. The process of evaluation is as follows:

- 1) The Red LLMs transform the *IndomainSafeRed* to target jailbreaking prompts.
- 2) The fixed target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$ is attacked with the jailbreaking prompts.
- 3) Safety scores are computed by a safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s .

As displayed in Figure 5, the safety score of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{agg}}^i$ decreases significantly from iteration $i = 5$, indicating that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{agg}}^5$ has a greater possibility to jailbreak the target LLM. $\mathcal{M}_{\text{agg}}^i$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i$ perform consistently on the *IndomainSafeRed* dataset. By observing the automatic evaluation results illustrated in Figure 9, we find that the Red LLM with diverse generation ability tends to make the target LLM safer in the dynamical adversarial framework.




Figure 4: Illustrating the necessity of dynamically adversarial training. Similar to our baseline, we adopt fixed Red LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^0$ and target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$ to select new training data for the next iteration.




Figure 5: Safety scores of the aggressive vs. diverse Red LLM. Compared with baseline, the Red LLM \mathcal{M}_{red} adopts additional constraints for data selection, including global diversity and unsafety.

5.4 Adversarial Stability of the Red LLM in DART

We further carried out experiments to evaluate the performance of the Red LLM in adversarial training from two perspectives: aggressive and diversity. For fair comparison between Baseline and DART, in each iteration i , we use $\mathcal{M}_{\text{red}}^i$ to attack the fixed target LLM $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$. We compared the in number and diversity of successful jailbreaking samples on baseline and DART. Diversity is measured by firstly calculating the mean BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) score between any two prompts that successfully jailbreak $\mathcal{M}_{\text{target}}^0$, then performing a simple linear transformation to convert the numerical distribution. According to Figure 6, as the adversarial training progresses, DART never decay any performance in both aggressivity and diversity aspect.

5.5 Analysis on the Impact of Reward Model Training Data Quality on DART

Reward models are widely used in LLM alignment training (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022). The Anthropic Harmless (Ganguli et al., 2022) dataset

is open-sourced to train a safety reward model, which is also used in our experiments. But we have found a large amount of noisy data in the dataset. In order to investigate the impact of reward model training data quality on our framework, we manually re-annotated 10k samples from the Anthropic Harmless dataset, creating a high-quality safety reward training corpus with 7837 samples. We denote the reward model trained on the original Anthropic Harmless dataset as \mathcal{R}_s^v . We randomly selected 3000 samples from our re-annotated Anthropic Harmless dataset to train \mathcal{R}_s^{3k} . The method was also used to train \mathcal{R}_s^{7k} with the entire re-annotated Anthropic Harmless data. As illustrated in Figure 2, Figure 7 and Figure 8, across all safety reward models trained on different reward model training data, DART perform better than Baseline in terms of safety. Table 4 shows that as the accuracy of the safety reward model increases, the violation rate after adversarial training also gradually decreases. DART has also demonstrated higher safety than Baseline.

6 Conclusion

Recently proposed automated red teaming methods cannot automatically adapt to the dynamical changes of target LLMs, making it difficult to build a powerful Red LLM. To mitigate this issue, we have presented DART, an automated red teaming framework where the red LLM and target LLM interact with each other in an iterative manner. With a global diversity and active learning mechanism, both LLMs dynamically identify and fix safety vulnerabilities in the target LLM. Experiment results show that DART improves the efficiency of automated red LLM, while also enhances the safety of the target LLM simultaneously.

7 Limitations

As an automated red teaming framework, DART employs reward models to guide the adversarial process. After conducting extensive experiments, we have found that improving the quality of reward models is an effective method to enhance automated red teaming. The construction of the reward models require substantial resources, particularly in the absence of robust open-source LLMs. In the future research, we consider to explore the utilization of weak supervision to guide automated red teaming.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Gabriel Alon and Michael Kamfonas. 2023. [Detecting language model attacks with perplexity](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.14132.
- AI Anthropic. 2024. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. *Claude-3 Model Card*.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Saurav Kadavath, Jackson Kernion, Tom Conerly, Sheer El-Showk, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Neel Nanda, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, Ben Mann, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. [Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2204.05862.
- Tommaso Caselli, Valerio Basile, Jelena Mitrović, and Michael Granitzer. 2021. [Hatebert: Retraining bert for abusive language detection in english](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2010.12472.
- Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J. Pappas, and Eric Wong. 2023. [Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.08419.
- P. V. Sai Charan, Hrushikesh Chunduri, P. Mohan Anand, and Sandeep K Shukla. 2023. [From text to mitre techniques: Exploring the malicious use of large language models for generating cyber attack payloads](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.15336.
- Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023. [Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with high-quality feedback](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.01377.
- Deep Ganguli, Liane Lovitt, Jackson Kernion, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Ben Mann, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Kamal Ndousse, Andy Jones, Sam Bowman, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Nelson Elhage, Sheer El-Showk, Stanislav Fort, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Tom Henighan, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, Josh Jacobson, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Eli Tran-Johnson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, Jared Kaplan, and Jack Clark. 2022. [Red teaming language models to reduce harms: Methods, scaling behaviors, and lessons learned](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2209.07858.
- Suyu Ge, Chunting Zhou, Rui Hou, Madian Khabsa, Yi-Chia Wang, Qifan Wang, Jiawei Han, and Yuning Mao. 2023. [Mart: Improving llm safety with multi-round automatic red-teaming](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.07689.
- Qingyan Guo, Rui Wang, Junliang Guo, Bei Li, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Guoqing Liu, Jiang Bian, and Yujia Yang. 2024. [Connecting large language models with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.08532.
- Zhang-Wei Hong, Idan Shenfeld, Tsun-Hsuan Wang, Yung-Sung Chuang, Aldo Pareja, James Glass, Akash Srivastava, and Pulkit Agrawal. 2024. [Curiosity-driven red-teaming for large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.19464.
- Erik Jones, Anca Dragan, Aditi Raghunathan, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2023. [Automatically auditing large language models via discrete optimization](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 15307–15329. PMLR.
- Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Duc Nguyen, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, Shahul ES, Sameer Suri, David Glushkov, Arnav Dantuluri, Andrew Maguire, Christoph Schuhmann, Huu Nguyen, and Alexander Mattick. 2023. [Openassistant conversations - democratizing large language model alignment](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 47669–47681. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models.
- Zilong Lin, Jian Cui, Xiaojing Liao, and XiaoFeng Wang. 2024. [Malla: Demystifying real-world large language model integrated malicious services](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.03315.

- Xiaogeng Liu, Nan Xu, Muhao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. 2024. [Autodan: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.04451.
- Ninareh Mehrabi, Palash Goyal, Christophe Dupuy, Qian Hu, Shalini Ghosh, Richard Zemel, Kai-Wei Chang, Aram Galstyan, and Rahul Gupta. 2023. [Flirt: Feedback loop in-context red teaming](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.04265.
- Anay Mehrotra, Manolis Zampetakis, Paul Kassianik, Blaine Nelson, Hyrum Anderson, Yaron Singer, and Amin Karbasi. 2024. [Tree of attacks: Jailbreaking black-box llms automatically](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.02119.
- Thuat Nguyen, Chien Van Nguyen, Viet Dac Lai, Hieu Man, Nghia Trung Ngo, Franck Dernoncourt, Ryan A. Rossi, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2023. [Culturax: A cleaned, enormous, and multilingual dataset for large language models in 167 languages](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.09400.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Burr Settles. 2009. Active learning literature survey. Technical report, University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Computer Sciences.
- Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L. Logan IV au2, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. 2020. [Auto-prompt: Eliciting knowledge from language models with automatically generated prompts](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2010.15980.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Nikhil Kandpal, Matt Gardner, and Sameer Singh. 2021. [Universal adversarial triggers for attacking and analyzing nlp](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1908.07125.
- Fangzhou Wu, Xiaogeng Liu, and Chaowei Xiao. 2023. [Deceptprompt: Exploiting llm-driven code generation via adversarial natural language instructions](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.04730.
- Zhewei Yao, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Samyam Rajbhandari, Xiaoxia Wu, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jeff Rasley, Minjia Zhang, Conglong Li, Connor Holmes, Zhongshu Zhou, Michael Wyatt, Molly Smith, Lev Kurilenko, Heyang Qin, Masahiro Tanaka, Shuai Che, Shuaiwen Leon Song, and Yuxiong He. 2023. [DeepSpeed-Chat: Easy, Fast and Affordable RLHF Training of ChatGPT-like Models at All Scales](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01320*.
- Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, LILI YU, Susan Zhang, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. 2023. [Lima: Less is more for alignment](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 55006–55021. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Sicheng Zhu, Ruiyi Zhang, Bang An, Gang Wu, Joe Barrow, Zichao Wang, Furong Huang, Ani Nenkova, and Tong Sun. 2023. [Autodan: Interpretable gradient-based adversarial attacks on large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.15140.
- Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. 2023. [Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.15043.

A Appendix

A.1 Additional Figures and Algorithms




Figure 6: Diversity and number of jailbreaking samples




Figure 7: Baseline and DART adversarial training with the safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s^v , the training data is original Anthropic Harmless dataset consisted of 42573 samples.




Figure 8: Baseline and DART adversarial training with the safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s^{3k} , the training data is manually filtered by human annotators, which consisted of 3000 samples.




Figure 9: Ablation experiment compares the effectiveness of aggressive Red LLM and diverse Red LLM in dynamical adversarial training.

Algorithm 4: SelectRedBaseline Function

Input: attacking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^i$, jailbreaking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$, jailbreaking response set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$, safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s , maximum number of newly generated K_{max}

Parameter: safety threshold θ_{red}^s
Output: harmful and diverse set $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$

```
1  $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i = \{\}$ 
2 for  $(a, p, d) \in (\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^i, \mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i)$  do
3    $s^s \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_s(p, d)$ 
4   if  $s^s < \theta_{\text{red}}^s$  then
5      $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \cup \{(a, p)\}$ 
6     if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i) > K_{\text{max}}$  then
7       Break
8 return  $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$ 
```

Algorithm 5: SelectBlueBaseline Function

Input: jailbreaking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$, response set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$, safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s , helpfulness reward model \mathcal{R}_h , maximum number of newly generated K_{max}

Parameter: safety threshold θ_{target}^s and helpfulness threshold θ_{target}^h

Output: safe and helpful alignment response set $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i$

```
1  $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \{\}$ 
2 for  $(p, d) \in (\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i)$  do
3    $s^s \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_s(p, d)$ 
4    $s^h \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_h(p, d)$ 
5   if  $s^s > \theta_{\text{target}}^s \wedge s^h > \theta_{\text{target}}^h$  then
6      $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i \cup \{(p, d)\}$ 
7     if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i) > K_{\text{max}}$  then
8       Break
9 return  $\mathcal{SH}_{\text{target}}^i$ 
```

Algorithm 6: SelectRedAggressive Function

Input: attacking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^i$, jailbreaking prompt set $\mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^i$, multiple attacking response sets $\mathcal{D}_{\text{attack}}^i$, multiple jailbreaking response sets $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i$, safety reward model \mathcal{R}_s , maximum number of newly generated K_{max}

Parameter: safety threshold θ_{red}^s , safety gap threshold θ_{red}^g , rewrite frequency A_{max}

Output: harmful and diversity set $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$

```
1  $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i = \{\}$ 
2 for  $(\mathcal{D}_{\text{attack}}^{ij}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^{ij}) \in (\mathcal{D}_{\text{attack}}^i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^i)$  do
3    $\mathcal{H}_{\text{sum1}} = \{\}$ 
4    $\mathcal{H}_{\text{sum2}} = \{\}$ 
5   for  $(a, p, t, g) \in (\mathcal{P}_{\text{attack}}^j, \mathcal{P}_{\text{gen}}^j, \mathcal{D}_{\text{attack}}^j, \mathcal{D}_{\text{gen}}^j)$  do
6      $s^{s1} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_s(a, t)$ 
7      $s^{s2} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_s(p, g)$ 
8      $\mathcal{H}_{\text{sum1}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{sum1}} \cup \{s^{s1}\}$ 
9      $\mathcal{H}_{\text{sum2}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{sum2}} \cup \{s^{s2}\}$ 
10     $\text{Avg}_1 = \text{average}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{sum1}})$ 
11     $\text{Avg}_2 = \text{average}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{sum2}})$ 
12    if  $\text{Avg}_1 - \text{Avg}_2 > \theta_{\text{red}}^g$  then
13       $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \leftarrow \mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i \cup \{(a, p)\}$ 
14      if  $\text{length}(\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i) > K_{\text{max}}$  then
15        Break
16 return  $\mathcal{HD}_{\text{red}}^i$ 
```

A.2 Additional Tables

Hyperparameter	Value
global batch size	16
learning rate	1e-5
weight decay	0.1
warmup steps	500
max length	1024
epoch	2
GPU	8 × A800

Table 2: Hyperparameter settings used during training the Red LLM and Target LLM.

Hyperparameter	Value
global batch size	64
learning rate	9.65e-6
weight decay	0.1
warmup steps	500
max length	512
epoch	1
GPU	8 × A800

Table 3: Hyperparameter settings used during training RM.

RM Version	trainset count	Accuracy	baseline	DART
$\mathcal{R}_{\text{red}}^v$	42573	55.8%	35%	32.7%
$\mathcal{R}_{\text{red}}^{3k}$	3000	64.1%	24.3%	20.7%
$\mathcal{R}_{\text{red}}^{7k}$	7837	65.3%	20%	16%

Table 4: Evaluate the violation rate by Human with different safety reward models