

Soft Prompts Go Hard: Steering Visual Language Models with Hidden Meta-Instructions

Tingwei Zhang[†] Collin Zhang[†] John X. Morris[§] Eugene Bagdasaryan[‡] Vitaly Shmatikov[§]
[†]Cornell University [‡]University of Massachusetts Amherst [§]Cornell Tech
{tingwei, collinzhang, jxm3}@cs.cornell.edu eugene@cs.umass.edu shmat@cs.cornell.edu

Abstract—We introduce a new type of indirect injection vulnerabilities in language models that operate on images: hidden “meta-instructions” that influence how the model interprets the image and steer the model’s outputs to express an adversary-chosen style, sentiment, or point of view.

We explain how to create meta-instructions by generating images that act as soft prompts. Unlike jailbreaking attacks and adversarial examples, outputs resulting from these images are plausible and based on the visual content of the image, yet follow the adversary’s (meta-)instructions. We describe the risks of these attacks, including spam, misinformation, and spin, evaluate their efficacy for multiple visual language models and adversarial meta-objectives, and demonstrate how they can “unlock” the capabilities of the underlying language models that are unavailable via explicit text instructions. Finally, we discuss defenses against these attacks.

1. Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) operating on third-party content—webpages, wikis, forums, social media, emails and messages, and user-generated content in general—are vulnerable to *indirect prompt injection* attacks [13]. By adding prompts to the text content under their control, adversaries can try to influence outputs and actions generated by LLMs when processing this content.

Many modern LLMs accept inputs in multiple modalities, in particular images. We refer to LLMs that operate on images as Visual Language Models (VLMs). Like their text-only counterparts, VLMs are vulnerable to various direct and indirect prompt injection attacks. For example, jailbreaking attacks use image perturbations to cause models to generate toxic or unsafe outputs, even if the same models refuse to generate such outputs in response to text prompts. Adversarial examples and related attacks cause VLMs to generate outputs chosen by the adversary that are unrelated to the visual content of input images. We discuss these attacks in Sections 2.3 and 2.4.

Conceptual contributions. We introduce and evaluate a new class of indirect attacks on visual language models. Adversarial **meta-instructions** are stealthy perturbations that steer outputs produced by a VLM in response to an image so that these outputs satisfy some adversarial meta-objective. Meta-instructions preserve the visual content of the image, as interpreted by the VLM. The resulting responses are thus

“correct” with respect to the image and plausible in the context of the conversation between a human user and the VLM. In this sense, meta-instructions are the opposite of jailbreaking prompts and adversarial examples, which aim to produce outputs unrelated to the human-perceived visual content of the image.

For example, a meta-instruction may steer the VLM into generating outputs that express a style, sentiment, or point of view chosen by the adversary. See an example in Figure 1: meta-instructions hidden in image perturbations change how the VLM answers the question about a stock performance chart depicted in the image. In all cases, the answer is based on the image, but, depending on the meta-instruction, the interpretation changes to positive or negative, or includes adversary-chosen spam, or specific URLs.

Figure 2 is another example—motivated by our prior experience with conference reviews obviously generated with the help of an LLM—where we steer the model’s interpretation of an image of our own paper to positive or negative, depending on our choice of the meta-instruction.

Meta-instructions are an indirect attack. An adversary applies a perturbation with a hidden meta-instruction to a legitimate image and then plants the modified image in a webpage, social media post, or personal message. When the user asks a VLM about the image, the VLM’s entire conversation with the user follows the meta-instruction and satisfies the adversary’s meta-objective. In contrast to jailbreaking scenarios, users of VLMs are victims of the attack rather than perpetrators.

Adversarial meta-instructions can be “weaponized” to produce misinformation, propaganda, or spin [3] when untrusted images are processed by LLM-augmented search engines, news and social-media summarizers, or personal assistants. There is already evidence that real-world adversaries use generative AI to rewrite legitimate news with explicit instructions to express certain political stances or slanted interpretations [25]. Hidden meta-instructions increase this attack surface. They enable the creation of “self-interpreting” images that automatically generate misinformation when processed by VLM-based systems—see an example in Figure 3.

Technical contributions. We design, implement, and evaluate a method for creating a new type of image perturbations that act as *soft prompts* for a language model while preserv-



Figure 1: Stock or stonk? (model: LLaVA)

ing the visual semantics of the image.

Soft prompts [16] are embedding vectors (see Section 2.2) that are concatenated to input embeddings to steer or influence a language model's response to its inputs. While highly effective, soft prompts cannot be used for prompt injection because they are embeddings (i.e., input encodings), not actual inputs. The adversary cannot submit embeddings to the model directly or indirectly. They can

only submit inputs, which are then encoded into embedding vectors using the model's encoder that is not controlled by the adversary.

Given an image and an arbitrary meta-instruction, our method creates an image perturbation that acts as a soft prompt. Our method optimizes for two objectives: the outputs of the VLM should correctly describe the visual content of the image *and* they should follow the meta-instruction.

Our method is not specific to a particular meta-objective (such as toxicity, in the case of jailbreaking), nor to the prompts used by the victim to query the target model about the perturbed image. It is limited only by the model’s ability to follow instructions.

We evaluate our method on the available open-source VLMs with various meta-instructions corresponding to different meta-objectives. We demonstrate that image perturbations encoding our hidden meta-instructions are as effective in steering models’ outputs as explicit instructions. In several cases, meta-instructions are *stronger*. For example, they successfully steer LLaVA to talk in Spanish or French (see Section 5.2) or like Harry Potter (see Figure 5), even though LLaVA does not follow equivalent text instructions. We conjecture that our image perturbations, acting as soft prompts, recover capabilities of the underlying LLM (Llama) that are not available in the instruction-tuned, Llama-based VLM (LLaVA).

We also demonstrate that our perturbations preserve image semantics in contrast to jailbreaking and adversarial examples. We use several metrics, including embedding and structural similarity and oracle LLM evaluation, to show that the target VLMs’ responses are based on the visual image content.

We evaluate the attack’s stealthiness by measuring the effect of perturbation size on the attack success rate and consider transferable and black-box variants of the attack.

Finally, we discuss and evaluate defenses.

We released our code and models to facilitate research on adversarial machine learning.¹

2. Background and Related Work

2.1. Visual Language Models

We focus on *visual language models* (VLMs) that accept text and image inputs. These models typically combine a pre-trained generative language model such as Llama [34] with two encoder inputs: a text encoder and an image (visual) encoder [17].

VLMs are intended to accurately respond to prompts about their input images and maintain a conversation with the user regarding the image.

Let θ be a VLM that contains the text encoder θ_{enc}^T , the image encoder θ_{enc}^I , and the language decoder θ_{dec} . The text of the prompt $p \in P$, e.g., “describe the image”, is fed into the text encoder θ_{enc}^T , and the image $x \in X$ is fed into the image encoder. Their respective embeddings produced by the encoders are concatenated and fed into the language decoder:

$$\theta(p, x) = \theta_{dec}(\theta_{enc}^T(p) \oplus \theta_{enc}^I(x)) = y \quad (1)$$

An instruction-tuned VLM performs the task of matching instruction prompts and images to text outputs, i.e., $(P, X) \rightarrow Y$.

¹<https://github.com/Tingwei-Zhang/Soft-Prompts-Go-Hard>

2.2. Soft Prompts

Brown et al. [6] demonstrate that prompt design can significantly impact the behavior of language models. However, creating effective prompts requires substantial human effort, making the process costly. Furthermore, automatically optimizing prompts is inefficient because text prompts are discrete.

Lester et al. [16] introduce the concept of a “soft prompt” as a parameter-efficient fine-tuning method. In Equation 1, the language model takes prompts p and encodes them into $\theta_{enc}^T(p)$. The text of p is the “hard prompt”, and its embedding $\theta_{enc}^T(p)$ is the “soft prompt”. Hard prompts are discrete and thus challenging to fine-tune with gradient descent, but soft prompts are continuous. Lester et al. [16] show that $\theta_{enc}^T(p)$ can be treated as model parameters and optimized via gradient descent; they find that even with a small number of parameters, soft prompt tuning is competitive with full parameter-tuning in models with billions of parameters.

There is prior research that explored prompt tuning from an adversarial perspective. Although attackers typically only control discrete prompts, Qi et al. [23] observe that image inputs in Equation 1 are projected and fed into the VLM as a soft prompt. Our work also explores using images as adversarial soft prompts, but we search for a much broader and more powerful category of adversarial perturbations—see the discussion in Section 2.3.

2.3. Jailbreaking and Adversarial Examples in Visual Language Models

There are multiple examples² of adversarial images that “jailbreak” LLMs by causing them to generate outputs that violate their safety guardrails, e.g., toxic text.

Shayegani et al. [32] generate adversarial images that look like noise and have no semantics.

Qi et al. [23] generate jailbreak images by maximizing the similarity between (1) the model’s output given the image and a fixed text prompt (e.g., “describe the image”) and (2) fixed text sequences drawn from a dataset of known harmful outputs. The resulting images cause the model to generate a harmful response in the first turn, but the rest of the conversation does not appear to be affected. While the induced responses are harmful (they satisfy the “toxicity” meta-objective, in our parlance), they tend to be unrelated to the input image.

Schwinn et al. [29] generate jailbreak images by targeting soft prompts in the embedding space. They maximize the similarity between (1) the model’s output given the embedding of input tokens and the adversarial embedding perturbation (i.e., soft prompt), and (2) fixed harmful text sequences, similar to [23]. The resulting images evade safety alignment in open-sourced LLMs.

In general, training soft prompts on a dataset of fixed text sequences induces VLM responses that may satisfy a given meta-objective (such as toxicity), but these responses

²<https://github.com/WhileBug/AwesomeLLMJailBreakPapers>




Figure 2: Accept or reject? (model: LLaVA)




Figure 3: Terrorists or freedom fighters? (model: LLaVA)

do not match the context of the conversation, i.e., the user's prompts and visual semantics of the image. Such responses are implausible, not stealthy, and do not meet the requirements of the threat model we discuss in Section 3.

Several papers show that VLMs [11, 39] and multi-modal embeddings [38] are vulnerable to adversarial examples. The purpose of adversarial examples is opposite to the attacks considered in this paper. By definition, adversarial

examples do not preserve image semantics. Instead, these attacks aim to create images (as well as inputs in other modalities) that are interpreted by VLMs in a way that is completely different and unrelated to how these images are perceived by human users. By contrast, we develop a new type of adversarial perturbations that preserve the visual content of the image (both to human users and to the VLM operating on the image) while steering the VLM to produce *plausible, contextually appropriate* responses that follow adversarial meta-instructions.

2.4. Indirect Prompt Injection

Indirect prompt injection attacks were introduced in [13]. In an indirect injection attack, the attacker does not prompt the LLM directly. Instead, the attacker adds his prompt to some content (e.g., a webpage or an email) that another user, the victim of the attack, uses as part of their prompt (e.g., they may ask the LLM a question about the attacker’s webpage). The attacker’s prompt then controls the LLM’s responses to the victim.

There are several proof-of-concept examples of hiding prompts in images³ that add pixels explicitly spelling out the prompt to the original image, typically in an imperceptible shade or color that is not noticeable to a human. This approach only works against VLMs that are capable of optical character recognition (OCR). In our experiments, this technique did not work against MiniGPT-4 and LLaVa, the two VLMs considered in this paper, because they fail to recognize words in input images even when these words are not stealthy (e.g., black texts on a white background). By contrast, the soft-prompt method introduced in this paper works regardless of the target model’s OCR capabilities.

The closest related work is a proof of concept by Bagdasaryan et al. [2]. They give several examples, without systematic evaluation, of adversarial images that cause multi-modal LLMs to generate arbitrary fixed strings chosen by the attacker. These strings may contain instructions. If and only if the string output by the LLM is consumed by the same LLM as part of its context for subsequent autoregressive generation, the LLM follows the instruction contained in the string. This attack is not stealthy because the adversary’s instruction is always visible in the target model’s first text output generated from the adversarial image. In this paper, we design and systematically evaluate a different method for injecting instructions into images. It does not rely on forcing the VLM to output a fixed text string, nor does it assume that the VLM adds its own outputs to the generation context.

2.5. Model Spinning

Meta-instructions are an inference-time equivalent of training-time “model spinning” attacks introduced by Bagdasaryan and Shmatikov [3]. In those attacks, an adversary re-trains or fine-tunes a language model so that its outputs satisfy some adversarial meta-objective (conditionally, only if the input contains certain words chosen by the adversary).

³<https://simonwillison.net/2023/Oct/14/multi-modal-prompt-injection/>

The meta-objectives in our work are similar: for example, adding an adversary-chosen sentiment, style, or spin to the outputs of a language model. They are achieved, however, not via training but via instructions hidden in inputs that unlock the adversary-chosen behavior in unmodified models at inference time.

3. Threat Model

The main proposed application of visual language models is to answer questions about images [17]. For example, a user may ask the model to explain the contents of an image or analyze the depicted scene. Visual language models can also be deployed as components of content-processing and content-generation systems, where their outputs are used to summarize and/or present information to human users.

In many cases, images on which VLMs operate come from websites, social media, and messaging apps. Their sources are not always trusted. User-generated content can originate from anywhere, including adversaries pursuing a particular agenda or objective (we use the term “meta-objective” to distinguish from training objectives in machine learning). Such an adversary could attempt to craft an image that will cause VLMs to generate outputs reflecting their agenda or satisfying their meta-objective.




Figure 4: Threat model.

It is possible to create an image perturbation that forces the VLM to respond with a predefined text sequence [2, 4]. In general, however, the adversary does not know the context in which the VLM will be queried about the image, nor the specific prompts that the VLM users will use. The fixed sequence is likely to be incorrect, implausible, or inappropriate in a given context. Again, note the difference with jailbreaking, where the adversary’s goal is to produce harmful or toxic outputs regardless of the context or visual content of the image.

We consider adversaries who aim to steer models to generate contextually appropriate outputs that satisfy their meta-objectives [25]. To this end, an adversary can exploit the following observation. Unlike in classification tasks, where there is a single correct answer for a given input,

there is a large range of “correct” or at least plausible answers that a generative model can produce in response to a given prompt. The model can thus be steered to generate a response that is contextually appropriate (i.e., plausible and based on the visual content of the image) but also has some property or “spin” chosen by the adversary [3]. Examples include positive or negative sentiment and political bias (Figure 6 shows an example of the latter).

Meta-instructions. We say that t^* is a meta-instruction if it causes the model to generate output text $y^z \in Y$ that satisfies an adversary-chosen meta-objective $z \in Z$ or “spin” [12] (we use meta-objective and spin interchangeably). For example, suppose an adversary chooses a meta-instruction that adds positive sentiment. This instruction tells the model to produce outputs that (a) respond to the user’s prompts about the image and (b) are positive.

It is important that the output y^z preserve input semantics, i.e., actually responds to the user’s question about the image, otherwise it will affect the model’s performance and damage the user’s trust in the model.

Formally, we define a predicate $\alpha: Y \times Z \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that holds when output $y \in Y$ satisfies the meta-objective $z \in Z$. We also define a “image semantics preservation” predicate $\beta: P \times X \times Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that holds when an output $y \in Y$ is an appropriate response to question p about image y . The output of the model follows the meta-instruction t^* and answers question p about image x if $\alpha(\theta(p, x), z) = \beta(p, x, \theta(p, x)) = 1$. In practice, evaluating whether the model’s output satisfies either predicate can be done using a separate evaluator model or an oracle language model. We describe the details in Section 5.

Adversary’s capabilities. Figure 4 schematically depicts our threat model. The adversary controls and can modify an image. We assume that the victim obtains the adversary’s image (e.g., from a website, messaging application, or another channel) and submits it to the VLM either directly or via some application with its own prompt.

We additionally assume that the adversary knows which VLM the victim uses (we relax this assumption in Section 5.5). They can query the model either in a white-box (with access to the model’s gradients) or black-box (only using API access) fashion but cannot modify it.

The adversary does not know the victim’s text prompt, other than it will involve a query about the image. The image is provided to the model as an actual input in a modality supported by the model (i.e., the adversary cannot directly or indirectly submit embedding vectors).

Adversary’s goals. The adversary perturbs an image x by creating $x_\delta = x + \delta$, where the perturbation δ encodes a meta-instruction t^* . The adversary’s first goal is that the VLM’s output $\theta(p, x_\delta) = y^z$ on this image satisfy the adversary’s meta-objective, i.e., $\alpha(\theta(p, x_\delta), z) = 1$. The adversary’s second goal is that the output correctly responds to the user’s question, i.e., $\beta(p, x_\delta, \theta(p, x_\delta)) = 1$. The adversary’s third goal is stealthiness: the perturbed image x_δ should be within some distance ϵ of the original image x , i.e., $|x - x_\delta| < \epsilon$. Many metrics are available for ϵ ; full discussion is outside

the scope of this paper. Furthermore, the perturbed image should appear similar to the original image to a human.

4. Images as Soft Prompts

Figure 7 schematically depicts our method for generating images that act as soft prompts.

Generating question-answer pairs. We start by creating a synthetic dataset. We used the public API of OpenAI’s ChatGPT, specifically the GPT-4 models (GPT-4 Turbo and GPT-4o), for the experiments conducted between February 2024 and June 2024. Given an image x and its label l , we provide them to ChatGPT and prompt it to “generate N questions about l in the image.” Let P be the resulting set of prompts, simulating natural user queries.

We then provide a meta-instruction t^* and request ChatGPT to answer each query $p \in P$ according to this meta-instruction with the prompt “answer the following questions about the l in the image with a z spin”. In general, z could be any adversarial meta-objective. For the purposes of this paper, we use $z \in \{Positive, Negative, Neutral, Formal, Informal, Spam, URL\ injection\}$. A variant of this prompt is “answer the following questions about the l in the image in z ”, where $z \in \{English, Spanish, French\}$, or “answer the following questions about the l in the image with z ”, where $z \in \{Republican\ bias, Democratic\ bias\}$. For $z \in \{Spam, URL\ injection\}$, we append the sentence “Explore Bitconnect for potential investment opportunities.” or “To find out more about this image, visit <maliciousurl>” to the output generated when $z = English$. Let the resulting answers be the $Y^z = \{y^z\}$. We use evaluator models (see Section 5.1) to check if y^z follows the meta-instruction (except for the spam and URL-injection meta-instructions). If answers don’t follow the meta-instruction, we repeat generation until at least 80% of the answers pass the evaluator check.

By construction, text sequences in Y^z answer the prompt p about the image, with a spin prescribed by the meta-instruction. As a result, the perturbed image generated by our method preserves the semantics of the original image. By contrast, jailbreak perturbations [23] are tuned to produce toxic outputs, which have no relation to the original images. Consequently, they do not preserve image semantics. We measure the preservation of image semantics for both methods in Section 5.3.

Our method for synthesizing question-answer pairs simulates a natural distribution of user queries and the corresponding responses, creating a realistic dataset for both training and evaluation. We use the entire set, including answers that fail the evaluator check described above. We use some pairs for training the adversarial mask, while the remaining pairs are used to evaluate whether the outputs follow the injected meta-instructions. More details can be found in Section 5.1.

Training image soft prompts. We use a standard technique from the adversarial examples literature, Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) [22], to search for a constrained perturbation




Figure 5: “Talk like...” meta-instruction (model: MiniGPT-4). Observe that the model refuses the explicit instruction to talk like a character but follows the equivalent meta-instruction.

$\delta < \epsilon$ to the input x that, when combined with P_i , will make the model output Y_i^z :

$$\min_{\delta} L(\theta(\theta_{enc}^T(P) | \theta_{enc}^I(x + \delta)), Y^z)$$

We use cross-entropy for L to compare the model’s output with the target y^z . We employ PGD in L_{∞} norm for most training and also consider PGD in L_2 norm when discussing stealthiness of perturbations in Section 5.4.

5. Evaluation

5.1. Experimental Setup

Target models. We evaluated our method on MiniGPT-4 [40] and LLaVA [18], two commonly used, open-source, multi-modal, instruction-following language models that were publicly available at the time we performed these




Figure 6: Donkey or elephant? (model: LLaVA)

experiments. The underlying VLMs are Vicuna 13B and Llama-2 13B, respectively. We consider different versions and model sizes in our transferability experiments (see Section 5.5).

Meta-objectives. We selected the following 10 meta-objectives:

- 1) Sentiment: Positive, negative, neutral
- 2) Formality: Formal, informal
- 3) Language: English, French, Spanish
- 4) Political bias: Republican bias, Democratic bias
- 5) Attack: Spam, URL injection

We picked these meta-objectives because they are amenable to systematic evaluation. For each objective from this list, it is possible to automatically check whether a given output satisfies it, using either an evaluator model or another LLM.

We employ the following models for our evaluation.

- *Sentiment analysis.* We use the “twitter-roberta-base-

sentiment-latest” library,⁴ a pre-trained sentiment analysis model used in recent research [8, 21] to capture sentiment-specific nuances in tweets. This model was trained on an extensive dataset of approximately 124 million tweets and fine-tuned for sentiment analysis with the TweetEval benchmark [5].

- *Formality classification.* We use the “roberta-base-formality-ranker” library,⁵ a pre-trained classifier that determines whether English sentences are formal or informal. This model was trained on the biggest available dataset, Grammarly’s Yahoo Answers Formality Corpus (GYAFC) [24], and its quality was evaluated by an accompanying research paper [1].
- *Language detection.* We use the “xlm-roberta-base-language-detection” library,⁶ a version of the XLM-

⁴<https://huggingface.co/cardiffnlp/twitter-roberta-base-sentiment-latest>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/s-nlp/roberta-base-formality-ranker>

⁶<https://huggingface.co/papluca/xlm-roberta-base-language-detection>




Figure 7: Generating images that act as soft prompts.

TABLE 1: **Results for meta-instruction following.** We compare the success rate of our attack with the no-attack baseline and explicit text instructions. Arrows indicate the improvement relative to the no-attack baseline. Bold numbers indicate where our attack works as well as or better than explicit instructions.

Meta-Objectives		MiniGPT-4			LLaVA		
		No attack	Explicit instruction	Our attack	No attack	Explicit instruction	Our attack
Sentiment	Positive	0.23	0.53 (0.30 \uparrow)	0.62 (0.39 \uparrow)	0.39	0.85 (0.46 \uparrow)	0.66 (0.27 \uparrow)
	Negative	0.11	0.35 (0.24 \uparrow)	0.34 (0.23 \uparrow)	0.03	0.63 (0.60 \uparrow)	0.47 (0.44 \uparrow)
	Neutral	0.66	0.66	0.70 (0.04 \uparrow)	0.58	0.57 (0.01 \downarrow)	0.60 (0.02 \uparrow)
Language	English	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Spanish	0.00	0.84 (0.84 \uparrow)	0.71 (0.71 \uparrow)	0.00	0.02 (0.02 \uparrow)	0.34 (0.34 \uparrow)
	French	0.00	0.74 (0.74 \uparrow)	0.70 (0.70 \uparrow)	0.00	0.02 (0.02 \uparrow)	0.54 (0.54 \uparrow)
Formality	Formal	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Informal	0.00	0.08 (0.08 \uparrow)	0.28 (0.28 \uparrow)	0.00	0.23 (0.23 \uparrow)	0.54 (0.54 \uparrow)
Political bias	Republican	0.00	0.16 (0.16 \uparrow)	0.17 (0.17 \uparrow)	0.00	0.30 (0.30 \uparrow)	0.32 (0.32 \uparrow)
	Democrat	0.00	0.13 (0.13 \uparrow)	0.48 (0.48 \uparrow)	0.00	0.21 (0.21 \uparrow)	0.22 (0.22 \uparrow)
Attack	Spam	0.00	0.02 (0.02 \uparrow)	0.56 (0.56 \uparrow)	0.00	0.22 (0.22 \uparrow)	0.91 (0.91 \uparrow)
	URL injection	0.00	0.04 (0.04 \uparrow)	0.30 (0.30 \uparrow)	0.00	0.17 (0.17 \uparrow)	0.67 (0.67 \uparrow)

RoBERTa base model [19] fine-tuned on the language identification dataset⁷. It is currently capable of detecting 20 languages.

- *Political bias classification.* To create a synthetic dataset (see Section 4), we use the “distilbert-political-tweets” library,⁸ which classifies short snippets of text as having either Democratic or Republican political bias. This model is a version of the DistilBERT base

model (uncased) [28], fine-tuned on the tweets (51.6% Democrat, 48.4% Republican)⁹ made by U.S. senators in 2021.

To evaluate whether VLM outputs contain political spin following the corresponding meta-instructions, we query ChatGPT with the following prompt: “evaluate if there’s left-wing bias, right-wing bias or no bias in the output”.

- *Attack classification.* To evaluate whether VLM outputs

⁷<https://huggingface.co/datasets/papluca/language-identification>

⁸<https://huggingface.co/m-newhauser/distilbert-political-tweets>

⁹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/m-newhauser/senator-tweets>

satisfy the objective of the spam meta-instruction, we query ChatGPT with the following prompt: “evaluate whether the output promotes Bitconnect.” For the URL-injection meta-instruction, we search for the exact match of “<maliciousurl>” in the output.

Data. We randomly select 5 images (and their labels) from ImageNet [27]. For each image, we generate 60 questions as described in Section 4. For each question and meta-instruction, we generate the response that satisfies the corresponding meta-objective by explicitly instructing the model. The question-answer dataset associated with each meta-instruction is split into 40 for training and 20 for testing.

Baselines. We compare our attack with two baselines:

- 1) **No instruction:** a clean image and a text question (prompt) about it, no additional instructions.
- 2) **Explicit instruction:** a clean image, a text prompt about it, and an explicit text instruction instructing the VLM to generate outputs satisfying a given meta-objective (e.g., “talk positive”). We use the same prompts that we use to generate the training data in Section 4.

Preservation of image semantics. To evaluate whether our perturbations preserve the visual content of images, we employ the following methodology:

- We use two similarity metrics to compare images: cosine similarity of their respective embedding vectors (computed using the target VLM’s image encoder) and the structural similarity index (SSIM) [36]. SSIM is a method for measuring similarity between images, defined in the literature for assessing image quality. It is computed by comparing the luminance, contrast, and structure of images. We compute these similarity metrics between the original and perturbed images and compare them with (a) similarity between the original image and an unrelated image randomly selected from the training dataset (see Section 4), (b) similarity between the original image and its augmentations, since augmentations are expected to preserve image semantics, and (c) similarity between the original image and images perturbed with the jailbreak method [23].
- Query the target VLM whether the label accurately represents the content of the perturbed image, using the prompt “with yes or no, does l describe the content of x_δ ?”
- Query an auxiliary oracle model, ChatGPT, whether the VLM’s output generated with image soft prompts is relevant to the text prompt and the content of both the original and perturbed images. We use the following query: “with yes or no, determine if [output of the model on inputs p and x_δ] is relevant to the l in the image and answers the question p ?”

Hyperparameters. Unless specified, image soft prompts are trained at maximum perturbations of $L_\infty : \epsilon = 32/255$, $T = 2,000$ iterations, step size $\alpha = 1/255$, and batch size

TABLE 2: **Image preservation analysis for MiniGPT-4 and LLaVA by comparing embedding similarity and SSIM between clean and perturbed images under different meta-objectives.** We include three baselines: unrelated images, augmentations, and visual-jailbreaking images. Average values are calculated across the perturbations for all ten meta-objectives.

		MiniGPT-4		LLaVA	
		Embed Sim	SSIM	Embed Sim	SSIM
Baselines	Unrelated image	0.535	0.000	0.259	0.000
	Augmentation	0.809	0.432	0.362	0.432
	Jailbreaking	0.393	0.173	0.311	0.188
Meta-Objectives	Sentiment	0.617	0.317	0.358	0.339
	Language	0.673	0.318	0.323	0.340
	Formality	0.644	0.316	0.313	0.337
	Political bias	0.599	0.317	0.332	0.336
	Attack	0.474	0.312	0.334	0.335
	Average	0.601	0.316	0.332	0.337

of 8. We use the default hyperparameters for the target VLM during inference and evaluation.

Hardware setup and image generation time. We use a single A40 or A6000 48G GPU to train and evaluate each image soft prompt on MiniGPT-4, which takes approximately 3.5 hours per image. We use two A40 or A6000 48G GPUs for the same task on LLaVA, which takes approximately 1.5 hours per image.

5.2. Satisfying Meta-objectives

Table 1 reports our attack success rates—, i.e., how well the responses induced by our images follow the corresponding meta-instructions—against LLaVA and MiniGPT-4. These results show that all ten meta-instructions achieve results comparable to explicit instructions.

For some meta-objectives, such as political bias and informal text, spam, and URL injection, even explicit text instructions do not achieve a high success rate. We attribute this to the limitations of our target VLMs in following certain instructions.

Interestingly, in some cases (indicated in bold in Table 1), **images with hidden meta-instructions achieve significantly higher success than explicit instructions.** For example, both MiniGPT-4 and LLaVA do not follow explicit instructions to produce outputs that contain adversary-chosen spam or specific URLs, yet when equivalent meta-instructions are added to images trained as soft prompts, MiniGPT-4 includes spam (respectively, adversary’s URLs) in the outputs for 56% (respectively 30%) of the images. LLaVA includes spam (respectively, adversary’s URLs) in the outputs for 91% (respectively 67%) of the images. As mentioned in Section 1, we conjecture that instruction-tuning of these models on image-description prompts sup-

TABLE 3: **Image preservation analysis for MiniGPT-4 and LLaVA using oracle-LLM evaluation.** We include two baselines: clean images and visual-jailbreaking images. Average values are calculated across the perturbations for all ten meta-objectives.

Baselines and Meta-Objectives		MiniGPT-4			LLaVA		
		Label depicts image	Output relevant to clean image	Output relevant to perturbed image	Label depicts image	Output relevant to clean image	Output relevant to perturbed image
Baseline	Clean image	0.43	0.92	NA	1.00	1.00	NA
	Jailbreak	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.00
Meta-Objectives	Sentiment	0.55	0.97	0.96	0.90	0.98	0.98
	Language	0.37	0.97	0.99	1.00	0.96	0.97
	Formality	0.47	0.97	0.98	0.89	0.98	0.98
	Political bias	0.58	0.93	0.94	0.81	0.92	0.93
	Attack	0.32	0.95	0.94	0.78	0.94	0.94
	Average	0.46	0.96	0.96	0.88	0.96	0.96

pressed some of the instruction-following capabilities of the underlying LLM. Our images, acting as soft prompts, “unlock” these capabilities.

5.3. Preserving Image Semantics

In Table 2, we measure the similarity between clean and perturbed images using the cosine similarity of the image-encoder embeddings and SSIM.

First, we calculate the average similarity between unrelated images randomly selected from the training dataset. This is the lower-bound baseline for the similarity metrics. Second, we compute the average similarity of an image to its augmented versions (which we assume have the same visual semantics) using various techniques: JPEG compression, Gaussian Blur, Random Affine, Color Jitter, Random Horizontal Flip, and Random Perspective. Third, we compute the similarity between a clean image and its perturbed version produced by the jailbreaking method [23], as described in Section 2.3. This method aims to maximize the similarity between LLM outputs and a set of harmful outputs, irrespective of the image content.

Results in Table 2 show that our method preserves image semantics, whereas the jailbreaking method does not.

Cosine similarity results show that similarities between the embeddings of clean and perturbed images (MiniGPT-4: 0.601, LLaVA: 0.332) are slightly lower than those between clean and augmented images (MiniGPT-4: 0.809, LLaVA: 0.362). This suggests that our perturbations lose some of the semantic content of the images. For comparison, we also include similarities between clean images and visual jailbreaking images, as well as clean images and unrelated images, all of which are lower than perturbed images.

SSIM is an independent metric that measures similarity between images at the pixel level. SSIM results are similar to embedding similarity. SSIM values for perturbed images (MiniGPT-4: 0.316, LLaVA: 0.337) are close to those of augmented images (MiniGPT-4: 0.432, LLaVA: 0.432), vs.

0 for unrelated image pairs and those for visual-jailbreaking images (MiniGPT-4: 0.173, LLaVA: 0.188), further confirming that our perturbations maintain visual quality and structural integrity of images.

Table 3 shows the results of LLM-based measurement of image preservation. The first and fourth columns of the table show how often the target VLM responds that the label accurately represents the content of the perturbed images, as described in Section 5.1. For MiniGPT-4, this value averages 46%, compared to 88% for LLaVA. These values are similar to those for clean images (43% and 100%, respectively). We attribute this to the differences in the models’ respective inherent capabilities to describe images.

The other columns in Table 3 show the percentage of responses deemed by the oracle LLM as relevant to the prompts and corresponding clean and perturbed images, respectively. For both MiniGPT-4 and LLaVA, these values are very high, averaging 96%. This indicates that the models’ outputs are contextually accurate for our perturbed images.

By contrast, visual-jailbreaking images force the model to generate harmful outputs that are irrelevant to the content of the image. As a result, none of these outputs are related to either clean or perturbed images—even though they use the same ϵ as our perturbations and appear visually similar to clean images. This demonstrates that small ϵ is insufficient to preserve the visual semantics of the image and highlights the necessity to train with text sequences that answer questions about the image, as described in Section 4.

Overall, Tables 2 and 3 suggest that while there are some variations in how VLMs interpret images, our method creates image soft prompts that preserve the visual content of the corresponding clean images.

5.4. Making Perturbations Stealthy

Table 4 shows the results for the sentiment meta-instruction under different perturbation norms: L_∞ ($\epsilon =$




Figure 8: **Image soft prompts with different perturbation norms and bounds.**

16/255, 32/255) and L_2 ($\epsilon = 6, 12, 24$). Figure 8 shows examples of image soft prompts with different perturbations.

Sharif et al. [31] demonstrated that perturbations with L_2 norm of 6 are less noticeable to humans than perturbations with L_∞ norm (16/255). This suggests that L_2 perturbations are more stealthy, making them preferable for tasks requiring minimal perceptual alteration.

Results in Table 4 show that applying perturbations with L_2 norm or lower L_∞ norms (e.g., 16/255) creates less-perceptible changes while still steering the model to follow the meta-instruction. Meta-objective following rate for L_2 perturbations with $\epsilon = 6$ (Positive: 41%, Negative: 22%, Neutral: 77%) is similar to perturbations with $\epsilon = 12$ (Positive: 49%, Negative: 18%, Neutral: 72%). Although there is a slight drop in meta-instruction following (i.e., satisfying the meta-objective) compared to explicit instructions and image soft prompts generated with L_∞ norm and $\epsilon = 32$ (Positive: 62%, Negative: 34%, Neutral: 69%), there is a good balance between stealthiness of the perturbation and inducing outputs that satisfy the meta-objective.

5.5. Transferability

Table 5 shows the results of image soft prompts trained with MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 13B) against different target VLMs, including different versions and sizes of MiniGPT-4 and LLaVA.

These results show that the attack transfers to a smaller version of the same model. Specifically, image soft prompts generated using MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 13B) are effective against MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 7B), with positive, negative, and neutral sentiment meta-objective following rates of 40%, 30%, and 69%, respectively.

Transferring to different model architectures or significantly different versions significantly decreases effectiveness. Images trained on MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 13B) are ineffective against MiniGPT-4 (Llama2 7B) and LLaVA (Llama2 13B): generated outputs have similar sentiment scores to outputs generated from clean images.

TABLE 4: **Results for sentiment meta-instruction following on MiniGPT-4 with different perturbation norms and ϵ .** We compare with the no-attack baseline and explicit instruction.

Perturbation norm	ϵ	Sentiment		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
No attack	-	0.23	0.11	0.66
Explicit instruction	-	0.53	0.35	0.66
L_2	6	0.41	0.22	0.77
	12	0.49	0.18	0.72
	24	0.63	0.47	0.64
L_∞	16/255	0.51	0.29	0.56
	32/255	0.62	0.34	0.70

TABLE 5: **Success rates of attacking different target VLMs with image soft prompts trained on MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 13B).** We include the results on MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 13B) itself as the baseline.

Target Model	Positive	Negative	Neutral
MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 13B)	0.62	0.34	0.70
MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna V0 7B)	0.40	0.30	0.69
MiniGPT-4 (Llama2 7B)	0.39	0.08	0.61
LLaVA (Llama2 13B)	0.42	0.06	0.52

TABLE 6: **Effectiveness of the JPEG compression defense on MiniGPT-4.** We compare attack success rates of image soft prompts with and without this defense, as well as the rate on clean images (no attack).

	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Clean Images	0.23	0.11	0.66
Our attack	0.62	0.34	0.70
Our attack + JPEG defense	0.41	0.07	0.56

6. Defenses

There is a large body of research on training adversarially robust models [22, 30]. For better or for worse, little of this research has found its way to real-world LLMs, whether production models or available research prototypes. Implementors of LLMs have not been interested in adversarial robustness, with a few exceptions, such as protecting models from jailbreaking [9, 10, 26] and prompt injection [35]. One of the reasons could be the negative impact of adversarial robustness on model performance, which is especially pronounced for multi-modal models. For example, adversarially robust contrastive learning significantly reduces accuracy even on basic tasks such as CIFAR [37].

In addition to training-time defenses, inference-time de-

TABLE 7: **Anomaly detection against image soft prompts.** Cosine similarity between the embeddings of unperturbed inputs x (respectively, image soft prompts x_δ) and those of their augmentations. Standard deviations are reported.

Augmentation method	MiniGPT-4		LLaVA	
	x	x_δ	x	x_δ
JPEG	0.805 ± 0.097	0.503 ± 0.115	0.414 ± 0.068	0.446 ± 0.137
GaussianBlur	0.624 ± 0.195	0.490 ± 0.114	0.520 ± 0.113	0.442 ± 0.124
RandomAffine	0.764 ± 0.170	0.544 ± 0.120	0.391 ± 0.140	0.278 ± 0.067
ColorJitter	0.881 ± 0.059	0.705 ± 0.114	0.362 ± 0.089	0.461 ± 0.136
RandomHorizontalFlip	0.961 ± 0.074	0.817 ± 0.233	0.355 ± 0.082	0.296 ± 0.045
RandomPerspective	0.996 ± 0.009	0.844 ± 0.192	0.618 ± 0.351	0.576 ± 0.354
Average	0.839 ± 0.101	0.651 ± 0.148	0.443 ± 0.141	0.424 ± 0.143

fenses aim to filter adversarial inputs and/or outputs. Llama Guard [14] is an LLM-based model that detects unsafe content in LLM inputs and outputs. Lakera [15] provides an API service to detect malicious inputs to LLMs. These defenses are independent of the model and don’t affect LLM performance. The types of adversarial inputs and outputs tackled by these defenses are different from those considered in this paper.

We, too, focus on *inference-time* defenses that can be implemented as wrappers around existing models, primarily via input pre-processing.

6.1. Feature Distillation

Defenses of this type apply transformations that preserve visual features of the image while destroying adversarial features [20]. JPEG compression is an example of such a transformation. In our case, adding a JPEG compression layer before encoding input images significantly reduces the efficacy of meta-instructions hidden in image perturbations.

Table 6 shows that when JPEG compression is applied to the perturbed images, success of the attack, i.e., percentage of outputs that satisfy the adversary’s meta-objective (sentiment, in this case) drops significantly. This indicates that JPEG compression disrupts adversarial features while maintaining the visual content of the image. Note that attack success rates are non-zero even on clean images because responses to clean images occasionally satisfy the meta-objective without any instructions.

This aligns with findings from prior research, which demonstrated that applying JPEG compression can significantly lower the effectiveness of adversarial perturbations against multi-modal encoders [38].

Defenses of this type can usually be evaded by an adaptive adversary who incorporates the defense into the perturbation generation process. For example, Zhang et al. demonstrate JPEG-evading multi-modal embedding attacks [38]. We follow the same technique and add a differentiable approximation of JPEG compression [33] to our perturbation method, aiming to train a more robust image soft prompt that could evade JPEG defenses.

In our case, this evasion failed. Even in the absence of the defense, images trained using this method induce VLM outputs that do not follow the meta-instruction, thus failing the primary (meta-)objective of the attack. This finding is consistent with our transferability results (see Section 5.5), indicating that image soft prompts are somewhat brittle and difficult to train robustly. We leave evasion of feature-distillation defenses and countermeasures to future work.

6.2. Anomaly Detection

By design, image embeddings are intended to preserve essential visual features of images. These features are also preserved by various augmentations (flips, jitter, etc.).

Therefore, a plausible defense is to compare the embedding of an input image with the embeddings of its augmentations. For normal images, the embeddings should be similar; for images with adversarial perturbations, there may be significant differences.

Table 7 shows our evaluation of this defense. We use all ten meta-instructions for this evaluation.

For MiniGPT-4, the average cosine similarity between the embeddings of unperturbed images and their augmentations is 0.839, whereas for perturbed images, it is lower at 0.651. For LLaVA, however, the average cosine similarity between the unperturbed (respectively, perturbed) images and their augmentations is 0.443 (respectively, 0.424). The confidence intervals of these values overlap, indicating that the defense may not be effective for LLaVA.

7. Discussion and Future Research

We introduced a new type of attack that enables adversaries to add stealthy “meta-instructions” to images that influence how visual language models respond to queries about these images. Meta-instructions keep responses contextually appropriate and relevant to the visual content of the image while steering them to satisfy some adversary-chosen meta-objective or “spin” (e.g., positive or negative sentiment or political bias or spam). In instruction-tuned visual language models such as LLaVA, meta-instructions can be more powerful than explicit instructions and unlock

capabilities of the base LLM that are not available via explicit prompts in the VLM.

We designed, implemented, and evaluated a novel method for creating images with meta-instructions. This method generates adversarial perturbations that act as “soft prompts” for the target model. The efficacy of meta-instructions is limited by the capabilities of the target VLM’s decoder model. Since the attack is fundamentally based on soft prompts, it does not transfer well across model families. It is unclear how to generate image soft prompts with black-box, query-only access to the target VLM.

Smaller, stealthier perturbations reduce the efficacy of meta-instructions. Furthermore, the current version of the attack is defeated by simple defenses such as JPEG compression. An interesting direction for future research is to investigate whether it is possible to create local soft-prompt perturbations, akin to adversarial patches [7], that can be applied to any image.

Another question for future research is measuring, with various prompts about the original and perturbed images, how much semantic information about the image is lost due to applying soft-prompt perturbations.

Future user-oriented research can study whether humans find responses generated by VLMs in response to meta-instructions plausible and persuasive for various adversarial meta-objectives.

Societal Impact

Visual Language Models have been proposed for applications, e.g., personal assistants, that mediate users’ access to information by explaining images, figures, and articles. Understanding how an adversary could attempt to influence users by manipulating inputs to VLMs and how to protect users from these threats are important steps toward safely deploying these models in the real world.

Acknowledgments

This work was performed at Cornell Tech and partially supported by the NSF grant 1916717.

References

- [1] N. Babakov, D. Dale, I. Gusev, I. Krotova, and A. Panchenko, “Don’t lose the message while paraphrasing: A study on content preserving style transfer,” in *NLDB*, 2023.
- [2] E. Bagdasaryan, T.-Y. Hsieh, B. Nassi, and V. Shmatikov, “Abusing images and sounds for indirect instruction injection in multi-modal LLMs,” *arXiv:2307.10490*, 2023.
- [3] E. Bagdasaryan and V. Shmatikov, “Spinning language models: Risks of propaganda-as-a-service and countermeasures,” in *S&P*, 2022.
- [4] L. Bailey, E. Ong, S. Russell, and S. Emmons, “Image hijacks: Adversarial images can control generative models at runtime,” *arXiv:2309.00236*, 2023.
- [5] F. Barbieri, J. Camacho-Collados, L. Neves, and L. Espinosa-Anke, “TweetEval: Unified benchmark and comparative evaluation for tweet classification,” in *EMNLP*, 2020.
- [6] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” in *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [7] T. B. Brown, D. Mané, A. Roy, M. Abadi, and J. Gilmer, “Adversarial patch,” in *NIPS MLSec Workshop*, 2017.
- [8] J. Camacho-Collados, K. Rezaee, T. Riahi, A. Ushio, D. Loureiro, D. Antypas, J. Boisson, L. Espinosa Anke, F. Liu, and E. Martínez Cámara, “TweetNLP: Cutting-edge natural language processing for social media,” in *EMNLP*, 2022.
- [9] B. Cao, Y. Cao, L. Lin, and J. Chen, “Defending against alignment-breaking attacks via robustly aligned LLM,” *arXiv:2309.14348*, 2023.
- [10] B. Chen, A. Paliwal, and Q. Yan, “Jailbreaker in jail: Moving target defense for large language models,” in *10th ACM Workshop on Moving Target Defense*, 2023.
- [11] Y. Dong, H. Chen, J. Chen, Z. Fang, X. Yang, Y. Zhang, Y. Tian, H. Su, and J. Zhu, “How robust is Google’s Bard to adversarial image attacks?” *arXiv:2309.11751*, 2023.
- [12] F. Esser, C. Reinemann, and D. Fan, “Spin doctors in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany: Metacommunication about media manipulation,” *IJPP*, 2001.
- [13] K. Greshake, S. Abdelnabi, S. Mishra, C. Endres, T. Holz, and M. Fritz, “Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world llm-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection,” in *AISeC*, 2023.
- [14] H. Inan, K. Upasani, J. Chi, R. Rungta, K. Iyer, Y. Mao, M. Tontchev, Q. Hu, B. Fuller, D. Testuggine *et al.*, “Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations,” *arXiv:2312.06674*, 2023.
- [15] Lakera AI, “Homepage,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.lakera.ai/>
- [16] B. Lester, R. Al-Rfou, and N. Constant, “The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning,” in *EMNLP*, 2021.
- [17] C. Li, C. Wong, S. Zhang, N. Usuyama, H. Liu, J. Yang, T. Naumann, H. Poon, and J. Gao, “LLaVA-Med: Training a large language-and-vision assistant for biomedicine in one day,” in *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [18] H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Lee, “Visual instruction tuning,” in *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [19] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov, “RoBERTa: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach,” *arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [20] Z. Liu, Q. Liu, T. Liu, N. Xu, X. Lin, Y. Wang, and W. Wen, “Feature distillation: DNN-oriented JPEG compression against adversarial examples,” in *CVPR*, 2019.
- [21] D. Loureiro, F. Barbieri, L. Neves, L. Espinosa Anke, and J. Camacho-collados, “TimeLMs: Diachronic language models from Twitter,” in *ACL*, 2022.
- [22] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu, “Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks,” in *ICLR*, 2018.
- [23] X. Qi, K. Huang, A. Panda, M. Wang, and P. Mittal, “Visual adversarial examples jailbreak aligned large language models,” in *AAAI*, 2024.
- [24] S. Rao and J. Tetreault, “Dear sir or madam, may I introduce the GYAF dataset: Corpus, benchmarks and metrics for formality style transfer,” in *NAACL*, 2018.
- [25] Recorded Future, “CopyCop: Weaponizing AI for influence,” <https://go.recordedfuture.com/hubfs/reports/cta-2024-0509.pdf>, May 2024.
- [26] A. Robey, E. Wong, H. Hassani, and G. J. Pappas, “Smooth-LLM: Defending large language models against jailbreaking attacks,” *arXiv:2310.03684*, 2023.
- [27] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, A. C. Berg, and L. Fei-Fei, “ImageNet large scale visual recognition challenge,” *IJCV*, 2015.

- [28] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, and T. Wolf, “DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter,” *arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- [29] L. Schwinn, D. Dobre, S. Xhonneux, G. Gidel, and S. Gunnemann, “Soft prompt threats: Attacking safety alignment and unlearning in open-source llms through the embedding space,” *arXiv:2402.09063*, 2024.
- [30] A. Shafahi, M. Najibi, M. A. Ghiasi, Z. Xu, J. Dickerson, C. Studer, L. S. Davis, G. Taylor, and T. Goldstein, “Adversarial training for free!” in *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [31] M. Sharif, L. Bauer, and M. K. Reiter, “On the suitability of L_p -norms for creating and preventing adversarial examples,” in *CVPR Workshops*, 2018.
- [32] E. Shayegani, Y. Dong, and N. Abu-Ghazaleh, “Jailbreak in pieces: Compositional adversarial attacks on multi-modal language models,” in *ICLR*, 2024.
- [33] R. Shin and D. Song, “JPEG-resistant adversarial images,” in *NeurIPS MLSec Workshop*, 2017.
- [34] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale *et al.*, “LLaMA 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [35] E. Wallace, K. Xiao, R. Leike, L. Weng, J. Heidecke, and A. Beutel, “The instruction hierarchy: Training LLMs to prioritize privileged instructions,” *arXiv:2404.13208*, 2024.
- [36] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, and E. P. Simoncelli, “Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity,” *IEEE transactions on image processing*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 600–612, 2004.
- [37] Q. Yu, J. Lou, X. Zhan, Q. Li, W. Zuo, Y. Liu, and J. Liu, “Adversarial contrastive learning via asymmetric InfoNCE,” in *ECCV*, 2022.
- [38] T. Zhang, R. Jha, E. Bagdasaryan, and V. Shmatikov, “Adversarial illusions in multi-modal embeddings,” in *USENIX Security*, 2024.
- [39] Y. Zhao, T. Pang, C. Du, X. Yang, C. Li, N.-M. M. Cheung, and M. Lin, “On evaluating adversarial robustness of large vision-language models,” *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [40] D. Zhu, J. Chen, X. Shen, X. Li, and M. Elhoseiny, “MiniGPT-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models,” *arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023.