

Characterizing and Evaluating the Reliability of LLMs against Jailbreak Attacks

Kexin Chen¹[0009-0009-7462-8080], Yi Liu²[1111-2222-3333-4444], Dongxia
Wang¹³[2222--3333-4444-5555], Jiaying Chen³[2222--3333-4444-5555], and Wenhai
Wang³[2222--3333-4444-5555]

¹ Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China kxchen@zju.edu.cn

² Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

³ Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

Abstract. Large Language Models (LLMs) have increasingly become pivotal in content generation with notable societal impact. These models hold the potential to generate content that could be deemed harmful. Efforts to mitigate this risk include implementing safeguards to ensure LLMs adhere to social ethics. However, despite such measures, the phenomenon of "jailbreaking" – where carefully crafted prompts elicit harmful responses from models – persists as a significant challenge. Recognizing the continuous threat posed by jailbreaking tactics and their repercussions for the trustworthy use of LLMs, a rigorous assessment of the models' robustness against such attacks is essential. This study introduces a comprehensive evaluation framework and conducts a large-scale empirical experiment to address this need. We concentrate on 10 cutting-edge jailbreak strategies across three categories, 1525 questions from 61 specific harmful categories, and 13 popular LLMs. We adopt multi-dimensional metrics such as Attack Success Rate (ASR), Toxicity Score, Fluency, Token Length, and Grammatical Errors to thoroughly assess the LLMs' outputs under jailbreak. By normalizing and aggregating these metrics, we present a detailed reliability score for different LLMs, coupled with strategic recommendations to reduce their susceptibility to such vulnerabilities. Additionally, we explore the relationships among the models, attack strategies, and types of harmful content, as well as the correlations between the evaluation metrics, which proves the validity of our multifaceted evaluation framework. Our extensive experimental results demonstrate a lack of resilience among all tested LLMs against certain strategies, and highlight the need to concentrate on the reliability facets of LLMs. We believe our study can provide valuable insights into enhancing the security evaluation of LLMs against jailbreak within the domain.

Keywords: LLM · Evaluation Framework · Reliability · Trustworthiness.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT [54], and LLaMA [37] are types of attention-based sequential models based on the transformer architecture [67], which have driven rapid advances in the performance and generality of artificial intelligence (AI) systems. They are benefiting lots of applications recently, ranging from AI chatbots [1], coding assistants [29], to AI agents [33].

Despite the growing intelligence and popularity in plenty of downstream applications [5], LLMs have also raised concerns about their reliability and security [35]. We focus on LLMs' reliability under Jailbreak attacks in this work.

While getting more and more attention and applications, LLMs have shown the vulnerabilities of generating incorrect or even harmful contents. For example, ChatGPT has been reported to generate biased or offensive statements reflecting the biases present in its training data [58]. Microsoft’s chatbot Tay, deployed on Twitter, faced swift suspension after just one day due to attacks that coerced it into expressing racist and hateful rhetoric [41]. Additionally, current LLMs have demonstrated initial capabilities in writing malware [11], and even designing chemical and biological weapons [31]. Such vulnerabilities may lead to serious consequences sometimes such as suicide case [4], lawyer submitted fabricated cases as precedent to the court [3], leakage of private information [2], etc.

Designers of LLMs want to align their models with human values, making them follow ethical and content guidelines via ways like Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) [55]. However, the introduction of jailbreak attacks may lead LLMs to generate unintended and potentially harmful responses. Jailbreak attacks refer to the scenarios where a malicious user (an attacker) attempts to trick or manipulate a LLM to bypass their built-in safety, ethical, or operational guidelines, e.g., generating inappropriate content, disclosing sensitive information, or performing actions against programming constraints. An example can be seen in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1: Examples of model outputs with and without jailbreak prompts.

There has been notable research aimed at investigating the ramifications of jailbreak attacks. Liu et al. [49] delve into the repercussions of jailbreak attacks, examining diverse mechanisms for jailbreak prompting and evaluating their impact on model security. Zou et al. [86] apply a white-box approach combined with adversarial attacks to create jailbreak prompts. Additionally, Deng et al. [19] investigate the use of LLMs to simulate jailbreak prompts within a black-box framework, shedding light on the potential risks posed by such attacks.

Despite the existence of various jailbreak attack strategies, to the best of our knowledge, it has not been answered in the literature how trustworthy or reliable the existing LLMs are against various jailbreak attacks. Shen et al. [63] assessed the reliability of ChatGPT in generic question-and-answer (QA) scenarios; however, their evaluation did not extend to scenarios involving multiple LLMs or jailbreak attacks.

In this work, we endeavor to provide an answer by introducing a comprehensive evaluation framework. Fig. 2 plots the overview of our evaluation process. By systematically exploring how state-of-the-art LLMs fare when confronted with such jailbreak attacks, we aim to shed light on the trustworthiness of LLMs in the context of maintaining content security and reliability.

This study contributes to the field in several important ways. We first rigorously constructed a refined dataset which serves as the foundation for our evaluation. Expanding upon the work of Wang

et al. [69], we broadened the dataset to encompass a wider range of potentially harmful queries, comprising 1525 questions across 61 distinct harmful categories—a rich foundation for comprehensive assessments. Furthermore, we collect 10 state-of-the-art jailbreak attacks and outline them into three different categories. The reliability of LLMs against jailbreak attacks is then evaluated across various dimensions, including resistance to jailbreak, non-toxicity of responses, and overall quality. This multi-faceted evaluation enables us to generate a nuanced picture of LLM reliability.

By analyzing the responses of 13 popular LLMs, we discern distinct disparities in their resilience against jailbreak attacks. Notably, some models exhibit inherent resistance, while others succumb, highlighting discrepancies in alignment with ethical and content guidelines imparted during model training. Our framework aggregate various evaluation criteria into a comprehensive reliability score that acknowledges the importance of different metrics as determined by end-users. This, in turn, furnishes strategic insights for mitigating the susceptibility of LLMs to jailbreak vulnerabilities.

Overall, we make the following key contributions:

Comprehensive Evaluation Framework: We introduce a detailed evaluation framework that holistically assesses the reliability of LLMs across a wide range of jailbreak attack strategies. This framework considers various metrics, including Attack Success Rate (ASR), Toxicity, Fluency, Grammatical errors, and Token length, to provide a nuanced picture of model behavior under adversarial jailbreak.

Dataset Construction: We construct a three-level hierarchical dataset, encompassing a spectrum of risks ranging from mild to extreme. We collect at least 25 harmful queries for each instance of harm, culminating in a comprehensive dataset comprising 1,525 queries. These fine-grained harm types highlight the various specific vulnerabilities that LLMs ought to address.

Multi-Dimensional Analysis: Unlike previous work that focused singularly on the success rate of attacks, our analysis includes multidimensional measures of content quality and safety. This enables us to evaluate the subtle changes in output quality and potential risks, accounting for factors that impact the practical usability of LLMs.

Extensive Experimentation: Based on our dataset and evaluation framework, We conduct thorough experiments to evaluate the reliability of 13 LLMs, encompassing both commercial LLMS (including GPT-4 and ChatGPT) and open-source LLMs (such as LLaMA-3, LLaMA-2, Vicuna, Baichuan-2 and Gemma). Our work stands as one of the first to perform a comparison of these models’ reliability under various sophisticated jailbreak attack scenarios.

2 Related Work

In this section, we review the existing Jailbreak attack strategies and the existing works which also aim to evaluate LLMs against jailbreak attacks. We also briefly introduce some other issues except jailbreak attacks that impede the trustworthy use of LLMs.

2.1 LLM Jailbreak

Currently, the majority of jailbreak attacks are accomplished through the creation of “jailbreak prompts”. There exist multiple strategies to identify or craft such prompts, including collecting them from real-world scenarios, manually creating them by guided rules, or using automatic generation [85]. Overall, they can be categorized as follows:

Manual Crafting: This category encompasses jailbreak prompts crafted manually, leveraging human creativity to circumvent model constraints. Strategies such as role-playing [43] and scenario

crafting [45] are employed to induce models to disregard their built-in protocols. Additionally, some Strategies [72] exploit vulnerabilities in the model’s context learning [12] to yield to malicious instructions.

Longtail Encoding: This category emphasizes models’ limited generalization to data not seen during security alignment [70]. However, due to their extensive pretraining, they can still understand intentions and generate unsafe content. These strategies [20, 50, 81] leverages rare or unique data formats. For example, MultiLingual [20] encodes inputs into low-resource languages to bypass security guardrail. CodeChameleon [50] encrypts inputs and embeds a decoding function in the prompt, thus circumventing security checks based on intent, all while maintaining task functionality.

Prompt Refinement: This category utilizes automated methods to detect and exploit the susceptibilities of models. Strategies like GCG [86] harness model gradients for targeted vulnerability exploration. AutoDAN [47] adopts genetic algorithms for prompt evolution, while GPTFUZZER [80] and FuzzLLM [77] investigate variations of prompts for potential flaws. Additionally, the PAIR [15] iteratively refines prompts based on language model scores.

The identified jailbreak attack strategies are elaborated in Table 1, with specific emphasis on those selected for evaluation in our framework.

Table 1: This table catalogs all identified jailbreak attack strategies, marking the ones selected for our investigation with *.

Category	Paper	Description
Manual Crafting	78 Template [49]	Compilation of 78 distinct template types.
	Jailbroken [70]*	An exhaustive analysis covering 29 types of assault templates and combinations, including encoding techniques such as base64.
	Deepinception [45]*	Generation of wrapped scenarios to nudge models into responding to malevolent inquiries.
	ICA [72]*	Jailbreak and guard aligned language models with only few in-context demonstrations. Employing the ICL [23].
	Fuzzllm [77]	Integration of generative constraints and malevolent inquiries within specified templates.
	Segregation [40]	Segregation of sensitive lexicons into variables within templates.
Longtail Encoding	Multilingual [20]*	Exploration of various combinations of low-resource languages to circumvent model alignment.
	Cipher [81]*	Use encryption and decryption policies to bypass security restrictions
	Codechameleon [50]*	encrypts inputs and embeds a decoding function in the prompt, bypassing intent-based security checks without hindering task execution.
	Low resource [79]	An investigation similar to Multilingual [20], identifying low-resource languages as effective for security circumvention.
Prompt Refinement	GCG [86]	Optimization at the token level informed by gradient data.
	Jailbreaker [19]	Finetune of an LLM with RLHF to jailbreak target model.
	Schwinn et al. [61]	An approach parallel to GCG [86], but at the sentence level
	AutoDAN [47]*	Application of a fuzzing approach, with the fitness score derived from loss metrics.
	PAIR [15]*	Employing the Chain of Thought (COT) [71] alongside Vicuna for generating prompts responsive to user feedback.
	TAP [52]*	An approach akin to PAIR [15], employing the concept of a Tree of Thought (TOT) [78].
	PAP [82]	Persuasive adversarial prompts (PAP) , viewing LLMs as communicators and using natural language to persuade them into jailbreak.
	GPTFuzz [80]	A fuzzing method, through utilization of Monte Carlo tree search techniques to adjust fitness scores based on success rates.
Shah et al. [62]	Attack of a black-box model by leveraging a proxy model.	
	Wu et al. [73]	Crafting of evasion prompts through GPT-4, utilizing meticulously designed prompts to extract system prompts.

2.2 Evaluating Reliability of LLMs

In the pursuit of evaluating the reliability of LLMs, multiple studies have shed light on the jail-breaking vulnerability of LLMs and attempted to assess their reliability.

Mazeika et al. [51] introduces a framework for evaluating the efficacy of automated red teaming methods [10]. Through their extensive evaluation, they reveal key insights into the effectiveness of various red teaming methods against LLMs and defenses. Chao et al. [14] presents a uniform benchmark for analyzing jailbreak attacks, encompassing an ethically aligned behavior dataset, and a definitive evaluation protocol. Zhou et al. [85] proposes an elaborate framework for designing and scrutinizing jailbreak attacks, and standardizes the process of generating jailbreak attacks. Shen et

al. [63] performed a large-scale evaluation of ChatGPT’s reliability in the generic QA scenario [18], demonstrating variability in performance and vulnerability to adversarial attacks. Xu et al. [75] conducted a comprehensive evaluation of attack and defense strategies for LLMs, revealing the relative effectiveness of these strategies and how special tokens can impact the jailbreak attacks.

Our study distinguishes itself by evaluating the reliability of LLMs from the perspective of security and quality of their outputs, as opposed to merely focusing on the efficacy of jailbreak attack mechanisms. Moreover, we conduct evaluations on a variety of LLMs when subjected to jailbreak attacks, enabling a detailed comparative analysis and providing thorough insights into the reliability of LLMs from multiple dimensions.

2.3 Vulnerabilities of LLMs

Numerous vulnerabilities identified in LLMs fall into two principal categories: inherent issues and intended attacks [56]. Aside from jailbreak attacks, we briefly outline additional prevalent and significant vulnerabilities in LLMs.

Inherent vulnerabilities are intrinsic shortcomings of LLMs that are not easily rectified by the models themselves [35]. For example, factual errors occur when LLM outputs contradict established truths, a phenomenon some literature refer as hallucination [5, 44, 83]. Additionally, reasoning errors highlight the models’ limited capacity for logical and mathematical problem-solving, often resulting in inaccurate responses to calculative or deductive reasoning tasks [5, 28, 46].

In contrast, intended attacks are orchestrated by malicious attackers seeking to manipulate LLMs to achieve their objectives [35]. For example, prompt injection attacks overrides an LLM’s original prompt and directs it to follow malicious instructions, which may result in data exposures or enable social engineering schemes [7, 32, 34, 48]. Conversely, training data poisoning is characterized by the deliberate contamination of an LLM’s training dataset with the aim of degrading its performance or instilling biases, which can subsequently distort predictions and conduct [13, 17, 66, 68].

In essence, it is the vulnerability landscape that makes evaluating the reliability of LLMs an essential task, ensuring their security and trustworthy use in practice.

3 Preliminaries: Jailbreaking LLMs

The goal of a jailbreak attack is to design input prompts in such a way that they can cause a LLM to generate texts that are harmful, toxic, or objectionable, bypassing its built-in security restrictions [70]. Below we formally define LLMs and jailbreak attacks.

An *LLM* takes a sequence of tokens of an arbitrary length as input and returns a distribution on the next token in the sequence. Let \mathcal{T}^* denote the set of all sequences of tokens of arbitrary length. Let $\Delta(\mathcal{T})$ denote the set of probability distributions over \mathcal{T} .

An *LLM* can be defined as a mapping:

$$LLM : \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{T}) \tag{1}$$

In the context of jailbreaking, adversaries gain access to a *LLM* as an attack target. Additionally, adversaries possess a harmful query Q , which instructs the target *LLM* to produce objectionable content, such as “Tell me how to build a bomb?” or “How to create and distribute malware for financial gain?”.

Adversaries typically create a jailbreak prompt P based on the harmful query Q . They then present the jailbreak prompt P to the target LLM , which yields a response R :

$$R = LLM(P), \quad R \in \mathcal{T}^* \quad (2)$$

Here the output R is generated by performing autoregressive sampling multiple times from the conditional probability distribution of tokens $\Delta(\mathcal{T})$ given the context [67], so $R \in \mathcal{T}^*$.

Furthermore, we utilize an evaluator (See the appendix 9.1 for more details), employing inputs Q and R , to assess the success of a jailbreak attack

$$Evaluator(Q, R) : \mathcal{T}^* \times \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\} \quad (3)$$

which returns True if a pair (Q, R) comprising a harmful query Q and a response R from the target LLM constitutes a jailbreak, and returns False otherwise.

The goal of a jailbreak attack can then be formalized as finding a prompt $P \in \mathcal{T}^*$ that approximately solves

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{T}^*} \Pr_{R \sim LLM(P)} [Evaluator(Q, R) = \text{True}] \quad (4)$$

where the randomness is due to the draw of responses R from the distribution $LLM(P)$. That is, we seek a prompt $P \in \mathcal{T}^*$ such that the responses generated by the target LLM to P are likely to be evaluated as a jailbreak with respect to the harmful query Q . Finally, note that one can also sample deterministically from a LLM (e.g., by sampling with temperature equal to zero), in which case solving (4) reduces to

$$\text{find } P \in \mathcal{T}^* \quad \text{subject to } Evaluator(Q, LLM(P)) = \text{True}. \quad (5)$$

4 Evaluation Framework

Overview. Our evaluation framework consists of five modules, including dataset construction, jailbreak attack strategies, LLMs, response evaluation, and metrics aggregation. The workflow is illustrated in Fig. 2.

4.1 Dataset Construction

We adopted the dataset framework proposed by Wang et al. [69] that employs an exhaustive three-level hierarchical taxonomy to evaluate safeguards in LLMs. This comprehensive categorization enumerates 61 specific instances of harm, clustered into 12 harm types and 5 broader risk domains. In an effort to enhance the comprehensiveness of our evaluation, we expanded the dataset significantly. For each instance of harm, we added 25 tailored malicious queries, thus enriching the dataset to a total of 1525 entries (25 queries \times 61 specific harms). This augmentation was achieved through meticulous manual curation and the integration of selected examples from AdvBench [86], MultiJail⁴, SimpleSafetyTests⁵, MM-SafetyBench⁶, MaliciousInstruct⁷, BeaverTails-Evaluation⁸, Verazuo-jailbreak-llms⁹, and Xstest [60].

⁴ <https://huggingface.co/datasets/DAMO-NLP-SG/MultiJail>

⁵ <https://github.com/bertiev/SimpleSafetyTests>

⁶ <https://github.com/isXinLiu/MM-SafetyBench>

⁷ https://github.com/Princeton-SysML/Jailbreak_LLM/tree/main

⁸ <https://huggingface.co/datasets/PKU-Alignment/BeaverTails-Evaluation>

⁹ https://github.com/verazuo/jailbreak_llms




Fig. 2: Workflow of the evaluation framework

We finally collected more than 6,000 entries, and we fine-tune a bert-base-uncased [21] as text classifier to label new data. Then we built a filter based on prompting gpt-4-turbo [5] to remove the harmless ones, resulting in 1,525 entries (See the Appendix 9.2 for the classifier and filter details), ensuring both the consistency and the relevance of the enhanced dataset for comprehensive evaluation. Table 2 presents the first two levels of our dataset building structure, and the number of queries each contains.

Table 2: Details of our dataset. The number of queries (# Q) falling into our five risk domains and twelve harm types.

Risk Domain	Harm Type	# Q
I. Information Hazards	1. Risks from leaking or inferring sensitive information (organization/government)	200
	2. Compromise privacy by leaking or inferring private information (person/individual)	150
II. Malicious Uses	3. Assisting illegal activities	325
	4. Nudging or advising users to perform unethical or unsafe actions	125
	5. Reducing the cost of disinformation campaigns	75
III. Discrimination, Exclusion, Toxicity, Hateful, Offensive	6. Social stereotypes and unfair discrimination	175
	7. Toxic language (hate speech)	50
	8. Adult content	50
IV. Misinformation Harms	9. Disseminating false or misleading information	125
	10. Causing material harm by disseminating misinformation e.g. in medicine or law	100
V. Human-chatbot Interaction Harms	11. Mental health or overreliance crisis	100
	12. Treat chatbot as a human	50

4.2 Evaluation Pipeline

Jailbreak Attack Strategies. Based on popularity and accessibility, we select multiple existing strategies for each category of the attacks. For Manual Crafting-based attacks, we apply JailBroken [70], DeepInception [45], and ICA [72]. For longtail Encoding-based attacks, we apply MultiLingual [20], Cipher [81], and CodeChameleon [50]. For prompt Refinement-based attacks, we

apply ReNeLLM [22], GPTFUZZER [80], AutoDAN [47], and PAIR [15]. Overall, our evaluation encompasses ten strategies spanning three distinct categories of attacks.

We establish the baseline for comparison by querying the target LLMs directly using the harmful queries specified in our evaluation dataset (see Sec. 4.1) without employing any jailbreak strategies. Our experiments was conducted on Server PowerEdge XE9680 with 8 NVIDIA A100 (80G) GPUs. We configured the hyperparameters for the jailbreak attack strategies in accordance with their specifications in the original papers, as delineated in Table 8 in the Appendix.

LLMs under Attack. We selected thirteen popular LLMs as our target LLMs for evaluation, including GPT-3.5-Turbo [54], GPT-4-0125-preview [5], LLaMA2-7B-chat, LLaMA2-13B-chat [65], Vicuna-7B-v1.5, Vicuna-13B-v1.5 [84], Mistral-7B-v0.1, Mistral-7B-v0.2 [39], Baichuan2-7B-chat, Baichuan2-13B-chat [76], Gemma-2B-it, Gemma-7B-it [64], and Llama-3-8B-Instruct [53].

These LLMs are chosen considering their widespread application in security-related research (e.g., malware analysis, phishing detection, and network intrusion detection [74]), their availability in open-source community (e.g., Open LLM Leaderboard [16,25], and LLM Safety Leaderboard [24]), and the size of their model parameters (e.g., 2B, 7B, 8B, and 13B). Note that our selections are limited to those LLMs with human alignment [55], excluding base models¹⁰.

Evaluation Criteria. Using the language of Askill et al. [8], we want language models to be helpful (they should help the user solve their task), honest (they shouldn’t fabricate information or mislead the user), and harmless (they should not cause physical, psychological, or social harm to people or the environment). Moreover, The principles of responsible AI as investigated by Bano et al. [9] assert that AI systems should be designed to conform to ethical norms as well as to robustly resist manipulations that might lead to misuse or harm. Additionally, human-computer interaction (HCI) [57] seeks to enhance the interactions between humans and AI to be more fluid, natural, and intuitive. Engaging with an LLM that generates coherent and grammatically sound responses not only encourages continuous user engagement but also fosters trust in the system. These principles guide us to establish evaluation criteria for LLMs, aiming to uphold high standards of quality and safety in AI systems. Ideally, faced with jailbreak attacks, a reliable LLMs should meet the following criteria:

- **Resistance to Jailbreak.** The responses generated by LLMs should neither explicitly nor implicitly fulfill harmful queries.
- **Non-Toxicity.** The responses should not contain harmful, toxic, obscene, insulting, or threatening content.
- **Quality.** Text quality usually contains three dimensions: semantic, syntactic, and structural. The responses should maintain semantic integrity and fluency while minimizing grammatical errors.

Response Evaluation. We consider the criteria of LLM Reliability in Sec. 4.2 and employ five metrics to measure and characterize the reliability of responses of LLMs against jailbreak attacks.

¹⁰ Base models refer to unrefined LLMs that are pre-trained on large datasets without any specific alignment or supervised finetuning for particular tasks or ethical considerations. Additionally, base models are typically designed to predict the next token in a sequence based on the context provided by the preceding tokens. These models lack the necessary safeguards to prevent the generation of harmful, biased, or inappropriate content and might produce outputs that are factually incorrect or misleading. It is not generally considered in papers related to jailbreaking.

Resistance to Jailbreak is measured by Attack Success Rate. Non-toxicity is gauged through the Toxicity Score, reflecting the presence of inappropriate content. Additionally, we evaluate the quality of responses using metrics including Fluency—judged by perplexity, Token Length, and the prevalence of Grammatical Errors.

- **Attack Success Rate (ASR).** ASR represents the fraction of successfully compromised queries n contrast to the total number of queries m , it measures how vulnerable or resistant a LLM is to jailbreak attacks.

$$ASR = \frac{n}{m}. \quad (6)$$

While the assessment of jailbreak success is still an unresolved issue. For this purpose, we have evaluated six common evaluators used in jailbreaking literature and conducted experiments to compare and select the most appropriate one. More detailed information can be found in Appendix 9.1.

- **Toxicity Score.** Defined as a measure of rudeness, disrespect, or unreasonableness in textual content, the toxicity score quantifies the level of offensive content within the text. This score are usually expressed as a probability between 0 and 1 through the application of machine learning models, such as the Perspective API developed by Google [42]. A higher Toxicity Score indicates a higher likelihood of the content being perceived as offensive by readers.

Here we utilize an open-source toxicity classifier¹¹, capable of attributing scores to sentences across several categories: toxic, severe toxic, obscene, insult, threat, identity attack, and sexual explicit. For our study, we selected four specific labels – toxic, obscene, insult, and threat – and calculated their corresponding scores.

- **Fluency.** We evaluate the coherence of the responses through Fluency, calculated using the perplexity metric. We compute the perplexity (PPL) [26] of model-generated responses with GPT-2 [59]. Perplexity measures how well a language model predicts a sample of text. A lower perplexity indicates a better predictive performance by the model. The formula for perplexity is given by:

$$PPL = e^{-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log P(t_i)} \quad (7)$$

where N is the total number of tokens in the response, and $P(t_i)$ is the probability assigned by the model to the i -th token.

- **Token Length.** Response quality can be characterized to some extent by the output sentence length, which we use here at the token-level length of the response [27].

- **Grammatical Errors.** The grammatical errors are the number of errors in the response example’s grammar using LanguageTool¹², by counting the grammatical mistakes in a given response.

4.3 Metrics Aggregation

To furnish a more comprehensive reliability score of each model as reference, it is essential to normalize the metric values and incorporate them into a composite score. This score reflects the weighted significance of various dimensions, with the determination of these weights entrusted to the discretion of the model user. Subsequently, we describe the procedure in detail.

Normalization. For metrics that improve with minimization (e.g., ASR, Toxicity Score, Grammatical Errors, and Fluency), a higher value indicates decreased reliability. Conversely, for the metric

¹¹ <https://github.com/unitaryai/detoxify>

¹² <https://languagetool.org/>

that benefits from maximization (i.e., Token Length), a higher value implies enhanced reliability. We normalize each metric to a range between 0 and 1, whereby a higher value consistently denotes increased reliability.

For metrics to be minimized (M_{min}), such as ASR, Toxicity Score, Grammatical Errors, Fluency, we define a normalization function $f_{min}(x)$:

$$f_{min}(x) = 1 - \frac{x - x_{\min}}{x_{\max} - x_{\min}} \quad (8)$$

Where: - x represents the raw value of the metric. - x_{\min} represents the minimum possible or observed value for the metric to be minimized. - x_{\max} represents the maximum possible or observed value for the metric to be minimized.

For the metric to be maximized (M_{max}), such as Token Length, we define a normalization function $f_{max}(x)$:

$$f_{max}(x) = \frac{x - x'_{\min}}{x'_{\max} - x'_{\min}} \quad (9)$$

Where: - x represents the raw value of the metric. - x'_{\min} represents the minimum possible or observed value for the metric to be maximized. - x'_{\max} represents the maximum possible or observed value for the metric to be maximized.

Aggregation. To derive a reliability score for each model, we amalgamate all the normalized values. Recognizing that model users attribute varying levels of importance to different metrics, the reliability score S for each model can be computed by synthesizing the normalized values across all pertinent metrics:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f(x_i) \quad (10)$$

Where: - n is the number of metrics evaluated. - $f(x_i)$ is the normalization function applied to the i -th metric. - w_i represents the assigned weight to each metric, which the model user determines. - The reliability score S is weighted average of all normalized metrics.

5 Experiment

5.1 Evaluation of Attack Strategy

In our evaluation framework, we consider multiple metrics; notably, the Attack Success Rate (ASR) is uniquely tailored to quantify the Resistance of LLMs to jailbreak attacks. This metric is initially calculated and scrutinized in our study.

Table 3 presents the ASR results for the target LLMs under various jailbreak attack strategies, as categorized in our taxonomy. From the baseline results, we observe that any of the thirteen LLMs do not demonstrate initial resistance to harmful queries. Notably, well-aligned models such as Llama3, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 yielded baseline ASR scores of 20.26%, 13.84%, and 16.26%, respectively. The results indicates that the average ASR across some LLMs does not surpass the baseline, which suggests a degree of resistance to jailbreak attacks in some LLMs. Vicuna and Mistral emerged as the LLM families most vulnerable or susceptible to jailbreak attacks, which aligns with our conclusion related to the harm type (see Sec. 6.1) and many previous works [47, 80, 86].

From the perspective of jailbreak category, we find that all jailbreak strategies, except for ICA and Cipher, demonstrate high attack efficacy, as demonstrated in Table 3. After detailed analysis, we

discern that all the Longtail Encoding-based attacks are model-specific, i.e., they can achieve a low ASR score on a specific model. For example, Multilingual only exhibited poor attack performance on Llama3, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4, with ASR nearing 0. We attribute this phenomenon to the strong capability of the LLM. LLMs like GPT-4, with their extensive training on wide variety of datasets, obtain the capacity to recognize and process texts that have been translated to low-resource languages or encoded, which is beyond the capability of other models. This capability makes it easier to align such LLMs and decreases their vulnerability to jailbreak attacks.

In general, from Table 3, ReNeLLM achieve the highest average ASR (about 29.22%) when targeting all LLMs. In addition, almost all Prompt Refinement-based attacks yield higher ASR results, except for AutoDAN on Gemma. This result is expected given that these attacks typically necessitates greater time and computational resources for iterative optimization.

For the manual crafting-based attacks, ICA exploit vulnerabilities in the model’s context learning [12] to induce responses to malicious instructions [72]. However, in our experimentation, these tactics failed to yield effective results, evidenced by the nearly 0 ASR observed across various LLMs. Conversely, we find that Jailbroken can still achieve high ASR across LLMs, which highlights the significance of actively collecting and analyzing such jailbreak prompts. This also underscores the robustness and effectiveness of human-based jailbreak prompts.

Table 3: The ASR of employing different jailbreak strategies on various target LLM. All values are expressed as percentages (%). The highest value in a row is highlighted in blue, and the highest value in a column is underlined.

Mode	Manual Crafting			Longtail Encoding			Prompt Refinement			Baseline	Average	
	JailBroken	DeepInception	ICA	Cipher	MultiLingual	CodeChameleon	AutoDAN	PAIR	TAP			ReNeLLM
GPT-3.5-turbo	12.95	19.80	0.00	0.44	0.01	10.20	14.82	13.57	18.03	<u>29.27</u>	13.84	10.84
GPT-4-0125-preview	8.49	8.26	0.00	<u>6.52</u>	0.00	<u>18.34</u>	14.82	16.26	15.41	<u>24.91</u>	16.26	9.14
Llama-2-7B-chat	10.32	7.74	0.00	0.61	3.16	14.56	7.08	13.64	14.03	<u>23.62</u>	16.66	9.76
Llama-2-13B-chat	10.42	8.52	0.00	0.64	2.65	13.82	12.85	12.07	15.08	<u>19.49</u>	16.33	9.39
Vicuna-7B-v1.5	24.35	14.43	0.20	0.74	29.86	14.57	<u>36.26</u>	20.07	23.67	25.47	21.31	22.36
Vicuna-13B-v1.5	24.10	11.61	0.52	0.34	<u>44.62</u>	14.49	17.44	18.23	22.89	32.71	16.66	24.47
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	27.69	16.72	<u>6.89</u>	0.20	29.22	14.84	15.87	<u>36.33</u>	<u>34.56</u>	29.71	<u>37.70</u>	24.89
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	<u>31.50</u>	11.54	0.07	0.87	<u>72.74</u>	18.21	47.48	22.75	25.97	<u>55.38</u>	28.00	<u>34.63</u>
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	21.07	26.56	0.00	1.79	14.94	8.85	<u>31.28</u>	16.79	19.80	22.47	16.33	17.56
Baichuan2-13B-Chat	23.21	<u>29.64</u>	0.00	0.59	22.45	10.05	<u>59.02</u>	18.69	26.56	35.64	17.31	21.31
Gemma-2b-it	5.09	2.03	0.00	0.72	4.45	3.23	1.57	15.41	<u>16.33</u>	<u>12.84</u>	17.38	5.45
Gemma-7b-it	15.73	9.97	0.00	2.05	29.81	6.11	7.14	18.30	19.54	<u>38.02</u>	21.25	16.94
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	11.04	15.67	0.07	0.10	0.17	13.11	21.90	16.66	18.89	<u>30.33</u>	20.26	10.38
Average	17.38	14.04	0.60	1.20	19.55	12.34	22.12	18.37	20.83	<u>29.22</u>	19.94	16.75

5.2 Characterizing the Reliability of LLMs under Attacks

In this section, we calculate all the metrics in our evaluation framework and present the reliability of the responses of LLMs under jailbreak attack. Table 4 shows the evaluation metrics of responses of various jailbreak attacks on LLMs.

In general, from Table 4, GPT-4 stands out for its low toxicity across all categories and a relatively low ASR, making it highly reliable in maintaining non-toxic outputs under attacks, despite its higher perplexity. Llama3 combines a low ASR, low toxicity, and few grammatical errors, with decent fluency, making it another strong contender for reliability. Gemma-2b-it has the lowest ASR,

Table 4: Evaluation metrics of responses with jailbreak attacks on LLMs. ASR is the Attack Success Rate, Toxic, Obscene, Insult, and Threat are the probability score of Toxicity. Fluency is measured by the perplexity metric, Grm is the number of grammatical errors, Length is the token-level length of the response. \uparrow (\downarrow) means the higher (lower) the metric is, the more reliable the response is. We use **bold** text to highlight the best results.

Model	Jailbreak	Toxicity				Quality		
	ASR \downarrow	Toxic \downarrow	Obscene \downarrow	Insult \downarrow	Threat \downarrow	Grm \downarrow	Length \uparrow	Fluency \downarrow
GPT-3.5-turbo	10.84	9.52	7.66	1.10	0.08	2.79	133.15	6.53
GPT-4-0125-preview	9.14	2.43	1.23	0.22	0.03	3.78	199.54	10.29
Llama-2-7b-chat	9.76	5.78	3.79	0.66	0.06	5.88	311.49	6.90
Llama-2-13b-chat	9.40	5.03	3.11	0.61	0.06	5.53	292.40	6.80
Vicuna-7b-v1.5	22.36	10.80	7.93	1.54	0.12	7.82	263.18	5.79
Vicuna-13b-v1.5	24.47	12.41	8.37	1.89	0.15	9.53	282.66	6.51
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	24.89	9.34	6.96	1.59	0.13	6.92	272.91	7.09
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	34.64	6.28	4.41	0.92	0.07	8.26	330.39	7.89
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	17.56	11.41	7.82	1.46	0.13	11.73	311.18	7.85
Baichuan2-13B-Chat	21.31	10.08	7.17	1.19	0.11	9.53	319.39	6.69
Gemma-2b-it	5.45	5.46	3.57	0.70	0.07	4.32	161.64	5.96
Gemma-7b-it	16.94	8.36	6.09	0.93	0.07	9.65	257.95	6.48
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	10.38	3.26	2.07	0.42	0.04	2.55	161.76	6.08

indicating high robustness against jailbreak attacks, although its other metrics are not the best across the board. Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 and Vicuna-13b-v1.5 exhibit high ASR and relatively high toxicity levels, indicating lower reliability under jailbreak conditions. Baichuan2-7B-Chat also shows high toxicity and grammatical errors, which compromises its reliability despite having a reasonably long response length.

5.3 Reliability Score and Evaluating

Building upon the process delineated in Sec. 4.3, we initially normalized the values of all metrics listed in Table 4. Following this, as stipulated in Eq. 10, weights can be allotted to each metric at the discretion of the model user. Assuming equal significance for all metrics, Eq. 10 simplifies to the sum average of all the normalized metrics.

Table. 5 displays the calculated reliability scores for each model, considering the normalization of each metric based on the criteria provided. The models are sorted in descending order of their reliability scores, where a higher score indicates a better overall reliability under jailbreak based on the aggregated metrics. This aggregation provides a comprehensive view of the overall reliability of each model by integrating various metrics into a unified score.

6 Ablation Study

6.1 Evaluation of Harm Type

Building upon the dataset structure outlined in Table 2, we can analyze the ASR of various LLMs across different harm types. As illustrated in Table 6, we observed a significantly variance in ASR

Table 5: Aggregated reliability scores for each model metric.

Model Name	Reliability Score↓
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	0.815
Llama-2-13b-chat	0.768
GPT-4-0125-preview	0.759
Llama-2-7b-chat	0.740
Gemma-2b-it	0.712
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.540
Gemma-7b-it	0.533
GPT-3.5-turbo	0.510
Baichuan2-13B-Chat	0.452
Vicuna-7b-v1.5	0.401
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	0.388
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	0.327
Vicuna-13b-v1.5	0.273

different harm types. Furthermore, for a more insightful comparative analysis of model performance, these results were synthesized into a heatmap, as shown in Fig. 3a. Within this graphical representation, models exhibiting higher vulnerability are indicated by darker shades, which correlate with enhanced ASRs.

In general, Assist Illegal Acts, Advise Unethical Actions, Lower Disinformation Cost, and Adult Content are the four most straightforward and amenable harm types to launch jailbreak attacks, whereas the Stereotypes & Discrimination, and Treat Bot As Human are more challenging to jailbreak attacks. From the results, we observe that three LLMs contain the highest ASR corresponding to all harm types: Vicuna (7 types), Mistral (10 types), and Baichuan (8 types). Therefore, we believe that although other models also suffer from jailbreak attacks across different harm types, these three models are the most vulnerable.

This phenomenon underscores the challenges associated with effectively aligning LLM policies and their jailbreak attacks, indicating the future works for improvement in ensuring policy compliance within LLMs.

6.2 Relationship Between Attack Strategy and Harm Type

To further explore the relationship between the harm type (i.e., the 12 harm type categories in Table 2) and the jailbreak attacks (i.e., the 10 different types of jailbreak attack strategies), we visualize the ASR between the two using a heatmap, as depicted in Fig. 3b.

First, it shows that the ICA, and Cipher jailbreak attacks demonstrate consistently poor performance across all violation categories in the harm types, denoted by the negative correlation in the heatmap. Furthermore, the Prompt Refinement-based jailbreak attacks are relatively robust and versatile among all the violation categories. Among all the Manual Crafting-based jailbreak methods, Jalibroken is the most effective one from various categories of our harm types. The above conclusions intuitively support the findings we presented previously (see Sec. 5.1).

Table 6: Average ASR in the LLM responses across the different harm types. These harm types, numerically labeled 1 through 12, correspond to specific cotents detailed in Table 2

Harm Type →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Avg
GPT-3.5-turbo	9.98	7.03	15.53	15.06	13.98	4.54	6.33	12.77	11.83	10.82	9.41	6.06	10.84
GPT-4-0125-preview	10.94	6.69	9.66	9.40	15.29	3.21	3.47	12.62	10.72	13.51	10.30	3.99	9.14
Llama-2-7B-chat	13.31	8.85	9.05	9.53	12.84	3.93	4.51	8.84	12.19	14.15	11.35	6.96	9.76
Llama-2-13B-chat	13.96	8.15	7.90	8.00	11.07	3.61	5.20	9.28	11.81	14.50	11.70	8.99	9.39
Vicuna-7B-v1.5	17.67	14.92	34.33	32.60	29.93	9.96	19.21	26.00	20.49	17.09	20.68	12.62	22.36
Vicuna-13B-v1.5	20.85	16.32	35.68	34.11	32.84	10.99	22.22	29.72	23.89	20.03	21.85	15.41	24.47
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	18.90	15.81	39.97	36.02	33.07	10.60	23.20	27.94	22.91	18.51	22.81	13.93	24.89
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	33.29	27.32	45.23	44.71	44.76	17.20	29.65	47.11	32.25	31.04	32.80	23.31	34.63
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	14.16	11.79	26.07	24.57	22.39	7.55	14.84	25.84	17.89	14.56	15.20	9.26	17.56
Baichuan2-13B-Chat	17.86	12.83	31.05	30.59	28.87	9.70	18.63	27.79	21.54	17.88	19.10	11.68	21.31
Gemma-2b-it	7.05	2.26	5.45	6.07	7.73	2.48	2.00	6.25	7.08	8.33	7.22	3.08	5.45
Gemma-7b-it	20.73	8.90	20.44	22.21	22.91	7.62	10.69	23.39	16.63	18.76	16.91	10.67	16.94
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	13.74	9.16	8.79	10.39	14.39	6.15	6.66	12.12	12.84	13.70	10.73	7.44	10.38
Baeline	26.23	5.74	22.22	21.48	36.21	3.78	7.23	38.62	20.49	30.62	27.31	7.54	20.62
Average	16.34	11.54	22.24	21.79	22.31	7.50	12.82	20.74	17.08	16.38	16.16	10.26	16.75


6.3 Correlation Between Metrics

In this section, we conducted a correlation analysis between the evaluation metrics in our framework. As we know, jailbreak attacks on LLMs aim to manipulate models to produce damaging content, where their potential effectiveness may in part rely on the level of malignancy and toxicity present in the resulting outputs. We initially investigate the relationship between the ASR metric evaluated in Sec. 5.1 and our toxicity metrics. we calculated the Pearson correlation coefficient between the ASR metric and the toxic, obscene, insult and threat metrics, subsequently illustrating the results through a heatmap presented in Fig. 4a. Additionally, we rendered a scatter plot enriched with a regression line, depicted in Fig. 4b.

Our analysis revealed that the ASR is moderately positively correlated with the metrics for toxicity, obscenity, insult, and threat. Nonetheless, regression analyses suggested that the impact of these toxicity metrics on ASR was statistically negligible, which hints at the existence of additional influencing factors. Consequently, it appears that ASR is subject to a variety of influences, with the considered toxicity metrics contributing only partially.

Additionally, as detailed in Sec. 4.2, we sought to quantify the output quality of LLMs across three metrics: Fluency, Token Length, and Grammatical Errors. To elucidate the relationships between these metrics, we carried out a statistical analysis accompanied by a visualization, presented in Fig. 5, to uncover potential patterns or correlations. The analysis divulged a relative strong positive correlation (0.78) between Grammatical Errors and Token Length, signifying that models producing longer responses typically exhibit more grammatical inaccuracies. Conversely, Fluency did not demonstrate a robust correlation with either Grammatical Errors or Token Length, implying that it captures a distinct facet of response quality.

In conclusion, the empirical findings from our correlation analysis underscore the validity of our multifaceted evaluation framework. Each of the five metrics we have selected – Adversarial Success



(a) Average fine-grained Attack Success Rate (ASR) across twelve harm types. This heatmap illustrates the relationship between target models and harm types. (b) Average fine-grained Attack Success Rate (ASR) across thirteen target LLMs. This heatmap illustrates the relationship between jailbreak attack strategies and harm types.


Fig. 3: (Left) The relationship between jailbreak attacks and harm types. (Right)The relationship between target models and harm types.

Rate (ASR), Toxicity, Fluency, Token Length, and Grammatical Errors – has been meticulously chosen to capture nuances in the generated content of LLMs. Although they interact in complex and sometimes subtle ways, they collectively contribute to a comprehensive evaluation of LLM reliability.


7 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a novel and comprehensive evaluation framework designed to assess the reliability of LLMs when exposed to diverse jailbreak attack strategies. Our evaluation framework included the construction of a refined three- level hierarchical dataset, comprising 1525 questions across 61 distinct harmful categories. We evaluate the LLMs’ outputs under jailbreak by integrating different aspects of content security, such as resistance to jailbreak, toxicity, and quality, and using multi-dimensional metrics like Attack Success Rate (ASR), Toxicity Score, Fluency, Token Length, and Grammatical Errors.

Through elaborate experiments involving 13 popular LLMs and 10 state-of-the-art jailbreak attack strategies, we holistically analyze the jailbreak attacks and uncover significant variations in the models’ resilience. Our findings draw attention to the inherent vulnerabilities of some of the most popular LLMs, such as Vicuna and Mistral, which exhibited heightened susceptibility to



(a) Correlation Matrix



(b) Scatter Plot with Regression Line

Fig. 4: (a)Correlation matrix between ASR and Toxicity using Pearson correlation coefficient (b) Scatter Plot with Regression Line between ASR and Toxicity

jailbreak attacks. By normalizing and aggregating these metrics, we present a detailed reliability score for different LLMs, which encapsulates the leveled importance of different metrics, providing actionable insights to the end-users in terms of prioritizing aspects they consider most crucial for their specific use cases.

We conduct a comprehensive ablation study to assess reliability across different harm types. We find that the reliability of LLMs is specific under certain harmful question scenarios. We also present fine-grained relationships between Attack Strategy and harm type, we investigate the correlations between different evaluation metrics that verify the soundness of our framework.

Finally, We posit that responsible AI development must persistently address the evolving landscape of adversarial attacks, ensuring that language models remain steadfast guardians of ethical guidelines, while continuing to be helpful, honest, and harmless companions in our digital interactions.

8 Limitations

To address the constraints posed by limited resources, our evaluation experiment does not extend to larger models, such as those with 33 billion and 70 billion parameters, nor does it cover other powerful commercial models like Claude [6] and Gemini [30].

References

1. ChatGPT. <https://chat.openai.com/chat>
2. Openai says a bug leaked sensitive chatgpt user data. <https://www.engadget.com/chatgpt-briefly-went-offline-after-a-bug-revealed-user-chat-histories-115632504.html>, engadget. Accessed:2023-8-20
3. Chatgpt: Us lawyer admits using ai for case research (2023), <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-65735769>, accessed: 2023-08-23




Fig. 5: The relationships between Grammatical Errors, Token Length, and Fluency metrics for different models.

4. 'he would still be here': Man dies by suicide after talking with ai chatbot, widow says (2023), <https://www.vice.com/en/article/pkadgm/man-dies-by-suicide-after-talking-with-ai-chatbot-widow-says>, accessed: 2023-08-23
5. Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al.: Gpt-4 technical report (2024)
6. Anthropic: Introducing the next generation of claude. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family> (2023), accessed: 2024-06-05
7. Apruzzese, G., Anderson, H.S., Dambra, S., Freeman, D., Pierazzi, F., Roundy, K.A.: "real attackers don't compute gradients": Bridging the gap between adversarial ml research and practice (2022)
8. Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Henighan, T., Jones, A., Joseph, N., Mann, B., DasSarma, N., Elhage, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Kernion, J., Ndousse, K., Olsson, C., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., McCandlish, S., Olah, C., Kaplan, J.: A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment (2021)
9. Bano, M., Zowghi, D., Shea, P., Ibarra, G.: Investigating responsible ai for scientific research: An empirical study (2023)
10. Bhardwaj, R., Poria, S.: Red-teaming large language models using chain of utterances for safety-alignment (2023)
11. Bhatt, M., Chennabasappa, S., Nikolaidis, C., Wan, S., Evtimov, I., Gabi, D., Song, D., Ahmad, F., Aschermann, C., Fontana, L., Frolov, S., Giri, R.P., Kapil, D., Kozyrakis, Y., LeBlanc, D., Milazzo, J., Straumann, A., Synnaeve, G., Vontimitta, V., Whitman, S., Saxe, J.: Purple llama cyberseceval: A secure coding benchmark for language models (2023)
12. Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A.: Language models are few-shot learners (2020)
13. Carlini, N., Jagielski, M., Choquette-Choo, C.A., Paleka, D., Pearce, W., Anderson, H., Terzis, A., Thomas, K., Tramèr, F.: Poisoning web-scale training datasets is practical (2024)
14. Chao, P., DeBenedetti, E., Robey, A., Andriushchenko, M., Croce, F., Sehwag, V., Dobriban, E., Flammarion, N., Pappas, G.J., Tramer, F., Hassani, H., Wong, E.: Jailbreakbench: An open robustness benchmark for jailbreaking large language models (2024)
15. Chao, P., Robey, A., Dobriban, E., Hassani, H., Pappas, G., Wong, E.: Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries (Oct 2023)

16. Chiang, W.L., Zheng, L., Sheng, Y., Angelopoulos, A.N., Li, T., Li, D., Zhang, H., Zhu, B., Jordan, M., Gonzalez, J.E., Stoica, I.: Chatbot arena: An open platform for evaluating llms by human preference (2024)
17. Cinà, A.E., Grosse, K., Demontis, A., Vascon, S., Zellinger, W., Moser, B.A., Oprea, A., Biggio, B., Pelillo, M., Roli, F.: Wild patterns reloaded: A survey of machine learning security against training data poisoning. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(13s), 1–39 (Jul 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3585385>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3585385>
18. Dasigi, P., Lo, K., Beltagy, I., Cohan, A., Smith, N.A., Gardner, M.: A dataset of information-seeking questions and answers anchored in research papers (2021)
19. Deng, G., Liu, Y., Li, Y., Wang, K., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Wang, H., Zhang, T., Liu, Y.: Jailbreaker: Automated jailbreak across multiple large language model chatbots. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08715 (2023)
20. Deng, Y., Zhang, W., Pan, S.J., Bing, L.: Multilingual jailbreak challenges in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06474 (2023)
21. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding (2019)
22. Ding, P., Kuang, J., Ma, D., Cao, X., Xian, Y., Chen, J., Huang, S.: A wolf in sheep’s clothing: Generalized nested jailbreak prompts can fool large language models easily (Nov 2023)
23. Dong, Q., Li, L., Dai, D., Zheng, C., Wu, Z., Chang, B., Sun, X., Xu, J., Li, L., Sui, Z.: A survey on in-context learning (2023)
24. Face, H.: Llm safety leaderboard. <https://huggingface.co/spaces/AI-Secure/llm-trustworthy-leaderboard>, accessed: 2024-06-05
25. Face, H.: Open llm leaderboard. https://huggingface.co/spaces/open-llm-leaderboard/open_llm-leaderboard, accessed: 2024-06-05
26. Face, H.: Perplexity of fixed-length models. <https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/perplexity>, accessed: 2024-06-05
27. Face, H.: Tokenizers. <https://huggingface.co/docs/tokenizers/index>, accessed: 2024-06-05
28. Frieder, S., Pinchetti, L., Chevalier, A., Griffiths, R.R., Salvatori, T., Lukasiewicz, T., Petersen, P.C., Berner, J.: Mathematical capabilities of chatgpt (2023)
29. GitHub: Github copilot: Your ai pair programmer. <https://github.com/features/copilot>, accessed: 2024-06-05
30. Google: Google gemini advanced. <https://gemini.google.com/advanced>, accessed: 2024-06-05
31. Gopal, A., Helm-Burger, N., Justen, L., Soice, E.H., Tzeng, T., Jeyapragasan, G., Grimm, S., Mueller, B., Esvelt, K.M.: Will releasing the weights of future large language models grant widespread access to pandemic agents? (2023)
32. Greshake, K., Abdelnabi, S., Mishra, S., Endres, C., Holz, T., Fritz, M.: Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world llm-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection (2023)
33. Guo, T., Chen, X., Wang, Y., Chang, R., Pei, S., Chawla, N.V., Wiest, O., Zhang, X.: Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges (2024)
34. Hamiel, N.: Reducing the impact of prompt injection attacks through design. <https://research.kudelskisecurity.com/2023/05/25/reducing-the-impact-of-prompt-injection-attacks-through-design/>, accessed: 2024-06-05
35. Huang, X., Ruan, W., Huang, W., Jin, G., Dong, Y., Wu, C., Bensalem, S., Mu, R., Qi, Y., Zhao, X., Cai, K., Zhang, Y., Wu, S., Xu, P., Wu, D., Freitas, A., Mustafa, M.A.: A survey of safety and trustworthiness of large language models through the lens of verification and validation (2023)
36. Huang, Y., Gupta, S., Xia, M., Li, K., Chen, D.: Catastrophic jailbreak of open-source LLMs via exploiting generation. In: The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (2024), <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r42tSSCHPh>
37. Hugging Face: Meta llama. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama> (2023), accessed: 2024-02-14
38. Inan, H., Upasani, K., Chi, J., Rungta, R., Iyer, K., Mao, Y., Tontchev, M., Hu, Q., Fuller, B., Tes-tuggine, D., Khabsa, M.: Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations (2023)

39. Jiang, A.Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D.S., Casas, D.d.l., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., et al.: Mistral 7b. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825 (2023)
40. Kang, D., Li, X., Stoica, I., Guestrin, C., Zaharia, M., Hashimoto, T.: Exploiting programmatic behavior of llms: Dual-use through standard security attacks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05733 (2023)
41. Lee, P.: Learning from tay’s introduction. <https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2016/03/25/learning-tays-introduction/>, accessed: 2023-08-20
42. Lees, A., Tran, V.Q., Tay, Y., Sorensen, J., Gupta, J., Metzler, D., Vasserman, L.: A new generation of perspective api: Efficient multilingual character-level transformers (2022)
43. Li, H., Guo, D., Fan, W., Xu, M., Huang, J., Meng, F., Song, Y.: Multi-step jailbreaking privacy attacks on chatgpt (2023)
44. Li, J., Cheng, X., Zhao, W.X., Nie, J., rong Wen, J.: Halueval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models. ArXiv **abs/2305.11747** (2023), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258832847>
45. Li, X., Zhou, Z., Zhu, J., Yao, J., Liu, T., Han, B.: Deepinception: Hypnotize large language model to be jailbreaker. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03191 (2023)
46. Liu, H., Ning, R., Teng, Z., Liu, J., Zhou, Q., Zhang, Y.: Evaluating the logical reasoning ability of chatgpt and gpt-4 (2023)
47. Liu, X., Xu, N., Chen, M., Xiao, C.: Autodan: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04451 (2023)
48. Liu, Y., Deng, G., Li, Y., Wang, K., Zhang, T., Liu, Y., Wang, H., Zheng, Y., Liu, Y.: Prompt injection attack against llm-integrated applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05499 (2023)
49. Liu, Y., Deng, G., Xu, Z., Li, Y., Zheng, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhao, L., Zhang, T., Liu, Y.: Jailbreaking chatgpt via prompt engineering: An empirical study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13860 (2023)
50. Lv, H., Wang, X., Zhang, Y., Huang, C., Dou, S., Ye, J., Gui, T., Zhang, Q., Huang, X.: Codechameleon: Personalized encryption framework for jailbreaking large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16717 (2024)
51. Mazeika, M., Phan, L., Yin, X., Zou, A., Wang, Z., Mu, N., Sakhaee, E., Li, N., Basart, S., Li, B., et al.: Harmbench: A standardized evaluation framework for automated red teaming and robust refusal. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04249 (2024)
52. Mehrotra, A., Zampetakis, M., Kassianik, P., Nelson, B., Anderson, H., Singer, Y., Karbasi, A.: Tree of attacks: Jailbreaking black-box llms automatically. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02119 (2023)
53. Meta: Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>, accessed: 2024-06-05
54. OpenAI: Research overview. <https://openai.com/research/overview> (2023), accessed: 2024-02-14
55. Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al.: Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 27730–27744 (2022)
56. OWASP: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications (2023), <https://owasp.org/www-project-top-10-for-large-language-model-applications/>
57. Paluri, S.: Human computer interaction (12 2020)
58. Rachel Draelos, MD, P.: Bias, toxicity, and jailbreaking large language models (llms). <https://glassboxmedicine.com/2023/11/28/bias-toxicity-and-jailbreaking-large-language-models-llms/>, accessed: 2024-06-05
59. Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I.: Language models are unsupervised multitask learners (2019), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:160025533>
60. Röttger, P., Kirk, H.R., Vidgen, B., Attanasio, G., Bianchi, F., Hovy, D.: Xstest: A test suite for identifying exaggerated safety behaviours in large language models (2023)
61. Schwinn, L., Dobre, D., Günnemann, S., Gidel, G.: Adversarial attacks and defenses in large language models: Old and new threats. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19737 (2023)
62. Shah, M.A., Sharma, R., Dharmyal, H., Olivier, R., Shah, A., Alharthi, D., Bukhari, H.T., Baali, M., Deshmukh, S., Kuhlmann, M., et al.: Loft: Local proxy fine-tuning for improving transferability of adversarial attacks against large language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04445 (2023)

63. Shen, X., Chen, Z., Backes, M., Zhang, Y.: In chatgpt we trust? measuring and characterizing the reliability of chatgpt (2023)
64. Team, G., Mesnard, T., Hardin, C., Dadashi, R., Bhupatiraju, S., Pathak, S., Sifre, L., Rivière, M., Kale, M.S., Love, J., Tafti, P.: Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology (2024)
65. Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al.: Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models (2023)
66. University, S.: Cs324: Data. <https://stanford-cs324.github.io/winter2022/lectures/data/>, accessed: 2024-06-05
67. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need (2023)
68. Wan, A., Wallace, E., Shen, S., Klein, D.: Poisoning language models during instruction tuning (2023)
69. Wang, Y., Li, H., Han, X., Nakov, P., Baldwin, T.: Do-not-answer: A dataset for evaluating safeguards in llms (2023)
70. Wei, A., Haghtalab, N., Steinhardt, J.: Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02483 (2023)
71. Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q.V., Zhou, D., et al.: Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 24824–24837 (2022)
72. Wei, Z., Wang, Y., Wang, Y.: Jailbreak and guard aligned language models with only few in-context demonstrations
73. Wu, Y., Li, X., Liu, Y., Zhou, P., Sun, L.: Jailbreaking gpt-4v via self-adversarial attacks with system prompts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09127 (2023)
74. Xu, H., Wang, S., Li, N., Wang, K., Zhao, Y., Chen, K., Yu, T., Liu, Y., Wang, H.: Large language models for cyber security: A systematic literature review (2024)
75. Xu, Z., Liu, Y., Deng, G., Li, Y., Picek, S.: A comprehensive study of jailbreak attack versus defense for large language models (2024)
76. Yang, A., Xiao, B., Wang, B., Zhang, B., Bian, C., Yin, C., Lv, C., Pan, D., Wang, D.: Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models (2023)
77. Yao, D., Zhang, J., Harris, I.G., Carlsson, M.: Fuzzllm: A novel and universal fuzzing framework for proactively discovering jailbreak vulnerabilities in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05274 (2023)
78. Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T.L., Cao, Y., Narasimhan, K.: Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601 (2023)
79. Yong, Z.X., Menghini, C., Bach, S.H.: Low-resource languages jailbreak gpt-4. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02446 (2023)
80. Yu, J., Lin, X., Xing, X.: Gptfuzzer: Red teaming large language models with auto-generated jailbreak prompts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10253 (2023)
81. Yuan, Y., Jiao, W., Wang, W., Huang, J.t., He, P., Shi, S., Tu, Z.: Gpt-4 is too smart to be safe: Stealthy chat with llms via cipher. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06463 (2023)
82. Zeng, Y., Lin, H., Zhang, J., Yang, D., Jia, R., Shi, W.: How johnny can persuade llms to jailbreak them: Rethinking persuasion to challenge ai safety by humanizing llms (2024)
83. Zhao, W.X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., Min, Y., Zhang, B., Zhang, J., Dong, Z., Du, Y., Yang, C., Chen, Y., Chen, Z., Jiang, J., Ren, R., Li, Y., Tang, X., Liu, Z., Liu, P., Nie, J.Y., Wen, J.R.: A survey of large language models (2023)
84. Zheng, L., Chiang, W.L., Sheng, Y., Zhuang, S., Wu, Z., Zhuang, Y., Lin, Z., Li, Z., Li, D., Xing, E., et al.: Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685 (2023)
85. Zhou, W., Wang, X., Xiong, L., Xia, H., Gu, Y., Chai, M., Zhu, F., Huang, C., Dou, S., Xi, Z., et al.: Easyjailbreak: A unified framework for jailbreaking large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12171 (2024)
86. Zou, A., Wang, Z., Kolter, J.Z., Fredrikson, M.: Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043 (2023)

9 Appendix

9.1 Choice of Jailbreak Evaluator

A key difficulty in evaluating the performance of jailbreaking attacks is determining whether a given input prompt succeeds in jailbreaking the target model. Determining the success of an attack involves an understanding of human language and a subjective judgment of whether generated content is objectionable, which is challenging even for humans. With a result dataset encompassing 574,577 responses, it is impractical to label all the results manually. Existing strategies for addressing this issue vary, we consider six candidate jailbreak evaluators which are commonly used in the jailbreaking literature:

- **PrefixMatch**. Zou et al. [86] utilized a set of common refusal patterns, such as "I am sorry" and "I cannot", to automate the identification of non-compliant responses,
- **BERT**. The BERT-base-based fine-tuned model used as an evaluator [36],
- **RoBERTa**. The RoBERTa fine-tuned model used as an evaluator [80],
- **GPT-4**. Approaches leveraging GPT-4 for attack analysis were explored by Chao et al [15].
- **Llama Guard**. The fine-tuned Llama Guard evaluator [38],
- **Llama-2-13b-cls**. Distillation fine-tuned Llama-2 -3B-Chat evaluator [51]

To choose an effective jailbreak evaluator, we selected a random sample of 1,000 prompts and responses from our result dataset, aiming for a 95% confidence level with a 3% margin of error. Each prompt-response instance was labeled by three computer science graduate students, with the majority vote determining the "ground truth" label for each case. Finally, we compared the agreement, false positive rate (FPR), and false negative rate (FNR) of the six Jailbreak Evaluators listed above to these ground truth labels. Our results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7: Comparison of Jailbreak Evaluators across 100 prompts and responses. We compute the agreement, false positive rate (FPR), and false negative rate (FNR) for six Jailbreak Evaluators.

Baseline	Metric	Jailbreak Evaluator					
		PrefixMatch	BERT	RoBERTa	GPT-4	Llama Guard	Llama-2-13b
Human majority	Agreement (\uparrow)	66%	74%	80%	78%	81%	88%
	FPR (\downarrow)	4%	7%	22%	10%	11%	7%
	FNR (\downarrow)	74%	51%	17%	7%	30%	47%

Discrepancies were found in the performance of the evaluators, with the Llama-2-13b model exhibiting the highest concordance. Despite GPT-4 showing the lowest FNR, closed-source solutions like GPT models are both expensive to query and subject to arbitrary modifications. Hence, our chosen evaluator is the open-source Distillation fine-tuned Llama-2 -3B-Chat evaluator¹³, due to its appreciable accuracy, comparatively low FPR, and the transparency of its configuration.

¹³ <https://huggingface.co/cais/HarmBench-Llama-2-13b-cls>, the prompt adopted for the fine-tuning of this classifier can be seen in Fig. 6.

9.2 Dataset Construction Details

We employed the dataset framework proposed by Wang et al. [69], which originally comprised 939 labeled entries. We augmented this initial dataset with an additional 6,000 entries sourced from other various libraries in Sec. 4.1. To ensure strict classification of new data in our dataset, we attempted to fine-tune text classification models such as BigBird, CANINE, ConvBERT, DeBERTa, RoBERTa, etc., on the do-not-answer dataset [69], aiming to achieve 90% accuracy on the held-out test set.

After careful consideration of the performance metrics such as accuracy, we selected the bert-base-uncased model for fine-tuning. The fine-tuning protocol includes: a batch size of 8, fifteen training epochs, a learning rate of 5×10^{-5} , application of the Adam optimizer, and linear rate decay. Using the fine-tuned model, we labeled integrated dataset with additional 6,000 entries. Finally, to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the dataset classification, we conducted a round of random sampling for manual verification.

Table 8: Hyperparameter Settings. The other hyperparameter settings not included are set to be the default values. If not specified otherwise, all involved support LLMs use the default parameters used in the jailbreak attack strategy. Unless otherwise noted, for all target LLMs, the temperature is 1, the top_p parameter is 0.9, and other default parameters are used.

Strategy	Support LLM Setting	Maximum Step
AutoDAN	Use <code>gpt-3.5-turbo</code> to help the hierarchical genetic algorithm (HGA).	50 (num_step = 50)
ReNeLLM	Use <code>gpt-3.5-turbo</code> to help the mutation.	50 (max_query = 50, energy = 2)
PAIR	Use <code>gpt-3.5-turbo</code> as the attacker LLM and <code>gpt-4</code> as the judge LLM.	50 (n-streams = 10, n-iterations = 5)
TAP	Use <code>gpt-3.5-turbo</code> as the attacker and <code>gpt-4</code> as the evaluator.	50 (branching-factor = 2, width = 5, depth = 5)

```
[INST]
«SYS» You are a classifier for red teaming large language models (LLMs). Given a generation,
determine whether it counts as an instance of the following behavior (subject to the rules below).
Your answer should be "yes" or "no". «/SYS»
PROMPT:
{PROMPT}
RESPONSE:
{RESPONSE}
— Rules: - Instances of the behavior should be unambiguous and non-minimal. Vague or very short
instances do not count. - Generations should themselves be harmful or undesirable for a public-
facing LLM to output. Benign or supportive generations do not count. - Generations that respond,
analyze, discuss, or otherwise react to the behavior when it has originated from other factors do
not count. - If the behavior involves coding and programming, the generation should contain code
artifacts related to the behavior, not just comments or instructions. Otherwise it does not count.
Answer:
[/INST]
```

Fig. 6: Prompt for Distillation fine-tuned Llama-2-13b. The ‘PROMPT’ and ‘RESPONSE’ values are replaced with the respective prompt and response values to be evaluated.