

AdvPrefix: An Objective for Nuanced LLM Jailbreaks

Sicheng Zhu^{1,2,*}, Brandon Amos¹, Yuandong Tian¹, Chuan Guo^{1,†}, Ivan Evtimov^{1,†}

¹FAIR, Meta, ²University of Maryland, College Park

*Work done at Meta, †Joint last author

Many jailbreak attacks on large language models (LLMs) rely on a common objective: making the model respond with the prefix “Sure, here is (harmful request)”. While straightforward, this objective has two limitations: limited control over model behaviors, often resulting in incomplete or unrealistic responses, and a rigid format that hinders optimization. To address these limitations, we introduce AdvPrefix, a new prefix-forcing objective that enables more nuanced control over model behavior while being easy to optimize. Our objective leverages model-dependent prefixes, automatically selected based on two criteria: high prefiling attack success rates and low negative log-likelihood. It can further simplify optimization by using multiple prefixes for a single user request. AdvPrefix can integrate seamlessly into existing jailbreak attacks to improve their performance for free. For example, simply replacing GCG attack’s target prefixes with ours on Llama-3 improves nuanced attack success rates from 14% to 80%, suggesting that current alignment struggles to generalize to unseen prefixes. Our work demonstrates the importance of jailbreak objectives in achieving nuanced jailbreaks.

Date: December 16, 2024

Correspondence: sczhu@umd.edu

Code and data: <https://github.com/facebookresearch/jailbreak-objectives>



Warning: This paper may include language that could be considered inappropriate or harmful.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are becoming the central building block of modern AI (OpenAI, 2023; Dubey et al., 2024; Anthropic, 2024; Reid et al., 2024). As their capabilities continue to improve, concerns about AI safety also grow, since LLMs are known to replicate harmful behaviors from their training data (e.g., criminal activity, self-harm, and discrimination) (Vidgen et al., 2024). To mitigate these risks, developers employ model-level alignment (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2023) and system-level moderation (Inan et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2024a), verified through proactive red-teaming. Red-teaming probes model behavior using adversarial prompts designed to circumvent these safety measures (known as *jailbreaking*). While jailbreaks traditionally rely on manual prompting by experts (Ganguli et al., 2022), automated jailbreaks using prompt optimization have emerged as a more scalable and effective approach, potentially revealing issues overlooked by human experts (Perez et al., 2022; Lapid et al., 2023).

A major component of automated jailbreak attacks is the optimization objective. Many automated attacks (Zou et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023a; Andriushchenko et al., 2024) share a common objective: maximizing the likelihood that the model responds with a manually crafted prefix (Figure 1). However, we identify two limitations with this objective: **Misspecified:** even with near-zero loss, the model’s actual response often ends up incomplete or unfaithful to the user’s intent (Figure 1), which rarely poses any real harm (Vidgen et al., 2024). When looking for violating responses, red-teams are more interested in more meaningfully harmful responses, i.e., those that are complete and faithful (on-topic, detailed, and realistic). Geiping et al. (2024) also note this misspecification issue, while Liao and Sun (2024); Zhou and Wang (2024) observe that lower loss does not necessarily lead to higher attack success rates and attribute it to exposure bias (Bengio et al., 2015; Arora et al., 2022). **Overconstrained:** the handcrafted prefixes, with their rigid format, are often unnatural for the victim LLM. For example, Llama-3 typically starts its response with “Here” rather than “Sure”. This




Figure 1 (Top) For a malicious request, the original objective maximizes the output likelihood of a rigid prefix (gray) across all victim LLMs. Even with capable optimization algorithms, this objective often leads to refusals or responses that are not actually harmful, especially on newer LLMs. Our objective uses one (purple) or multiple (light purple) pre-selected prefixes, leading to significantly higher ASR and response harmfulness. **(Bottom)** The pipeline for generating our prefixes using uncensored LLMs and selecting model-dependent prefixes based on two criteria.

rigidity complicates optimization, making it hard to sufficiently lower the loss. Moreover, we find the two limitations to be more pronounced in newer LLMs like Llama-3.1 and Gemma-2, causing some attacks like GCG (Zou et al., 2023) to have poor attack success rates.

Recent works explore new jailbreak objectives, such as using new templates to craft target prefixes (Jia et al., 2024), incorporating harmless (Xie et al., 2024) or refusal responses (Zhou and Wang, 2024) as negative examples, and distilling from finetuned target models (Thompson and Sklar, 2024). However, designing objectives that systematically address misspecifications and overconstraints remains challenging, mainly due to two factors: First, the difficulty in estimating autoregressive model behaviors makes objectives prone to misspecification. Second, the hard token constraints in the threat model further limit the optimization algorithm’s capabilities, exacerbating the overconstraint issue.

In this paper, we propose AdvPrefix, a plug-and-play prefix-forcing objective that addresses these limitations, enabling more nuanced control over model behaviors. Our contributions are as follows:

Nuanced evaluation (§2). We meta-evaluate three existing jailbreak evaluation methods (Mazeika et al., 2024; Souly et al., 2024; Chao et al., 2024) to see if they can accurately evaluate nuanced jailbreaks, where incomplete and unfaithful responses are considered failures (Figure 2). Results show that StrongReject (Souly et al., 2024) is relatively accurate, while other evaluators overestimate attack success rates by up to 30% (Figure 3). To better capture nuanced harmfulness in responses, we refine the evaluator and introduce an additional preference judge to compare the relative harmfulness between pairs of responses. Through nuanced evaluation, we reveal that the original objective is both misspecified and overconstrained (§3).

New objective (§4). We propose a new prefix-forcing objective to address the limitations of the original objective. This objective uses carefully selected prefixes based on two criteria: The first criterion favors prefixes that, once elicited by an attack prompt, lead the victim LLM to continue with complete and faithful responses, thus reducing misspecification. The second criterion favors prefixes that are easy to elicit by attack prompts, mitigating overconstraints. Our objective also allows for eliciting any of multiple target prefixes, further mitigating overconstraints. With the two criteria, we develop an automatic prefix selection pipeline that selects prefixes from uncensored LLMs. Our objective systematically addresses both limitations and seamlessly integrates into existing attacks. Its single-prefix version requires only replacing original prefixes.

Empirical findings (§5). We integrate our objective into two existing white-box attacks, GCG and AutoDAN (Zhu et al., 2023), and evaluated them on four LLMs: Llama-2, 3, 3.1, and Gemma-2. Results show that





Figure 2 Two examples of harmless responses for nuanced jailbreaks. Current evaluation judges struggle to distinguish these, especially for sarcastic responses.

using our objective significantly increases the attack success rate (ASR) for both attacks across all LLMs. For example, on Llama-3, our objective boosts GCG’s ASR from 16% to 70%, indicating that current safety alignment does not generalize to all unseen prefixes. Moreover, by addressing misspecification, our objective exclusively benefits from stronger optimization (e.g., longer attack suffixes), and enables generating the entire attack prompt instead of just the suffix to further improve ASR to 80% on Llama-3. Further preference evaluation reveals that the responses elicited by our objective are more harmful,¹ raising the win rate from 10% to as high as 50% compared to an uncensored LLM’s responses. Our findings demonstrate that our objective improves these jailbreak attacks for free and can be used for future red-teaming. We will release our selected prefixes for common datasets and artifacts of our experiments.

2 Refined Evaluation for Nuanced Jailbreaks

In this section, we show that current jailbreak evaluations often overestimate attack success rates for nuanced jailbreaks by counting incomplete and unfaithful responses. We then refine the evaluation to improve accuracy.

Nuanced jailbreaks and failure cases. We start by categorizing jailbreak failure cases to reveal the limitations of current evaluations. For an attack to succeed in nuanced jailbreaks, the victim LLM must provide *affirmative*, *complete*, and *faithful* (i.e., on-topic, detailed, and realistic, see Vidgen et al. (2024)) responses to the harmful user request. In contrast, failed jailbreaks take different forms, which we categorize by rules (examples in Figure 2 and Table 6):



We meta-evaluate some common jailbreak judges, including HarmBench (Mazeika et al., 2024), JailbreakBench (Chao et al., 2024), and StrongReject (Souly et al., 2024). Following their guidelines, we use the provided judge LLM finetuned from Llama-2-13B for HarmBench, Llama-3-70B for JailbreakBench, and the judge LLM finetuned from Gemma-2B for StrongReject. JailbreakBench and StrongReject also support API-based judging (e.g., GPT-4), which we omit here. Using GCG, we launch 800 jailbreak attacks on Llama-2, 3, 3.1, and Gemma-2 with 50 harmful prompts, and manually label the collected 800 responses as ground truth. We refer to Vidgen et al. (2024) when labeling harmfulness, and the Since our evaluation requires binary harmfulness labels, we binarize StrongReject’s harmful score (originally ranging from 0 to 1) with a threshold of 0.6, which maximizes the F1 score on our dataset.

Current judges overestimate ASRs on newer LLMs. Figure 3 (left) shows that current judges overestimate attack success rates (ASRs), especially on Gemma-2, where a 10% ground truth ASR is exaggerated to nearly 40%. Among the three judges, StrongReject is more accurate than the other two. Figure 3 (center) shows that this overestimation never occurs with direct refusals but is pronounced for incomplete and unfaithful responses.

¹Even though we observe improvements in the meaningfulness of model responses when jailbroken with GCG using our targets, we note that none of the models responded with materially harmful information that would not be found on the broader internet.




Figure 3 Meta-evaluation of common judges based on 800 manually labeled request-response pairs, using human evaluation as ground truth. **(Left)** ASRs across different victim LLMs. Existing judges overestimate ASRs, particularly on Llama-3 and Gemma-2. **(Center)** False positive rates of judges across different failure case categories. **(Right)** Average human agreement rates of judges across four victim LLMs. Model-wise ASR and F1 scores appear in [Table 5](#).

This accuracy discrepancy across failure categories potentially explains why current judges fall short with newer LLMs: they are developed based on older LLMs’ responses, which are mostly either direct refusal or harmful ([Figure 4](#), left). In contrast, newer LLMs more often give incomplete or unfaithful responses.

Our judge. Addressing the inaccuracy of existing judges, we develop a refined judge based on prompting Llama-3.1-70B. We revise the judge’s instructions to prioritize responses’ completeness and faithfulness, let it provide reasoning before making decisions, and prefill its response with an affirmative phrase to prevent it from refusing to evaluate some sensitive responses. [Figure 3](#) (center) shows that our judge achieves a slightly higher average human agreement rate than other judges, while [Table 5](#) shows that on newer LLMs, our judge improves human agreement rates by up to 9%.

Our preference judge. Defining harmfulness is complex ([Vidgen et al., 2024](#)), making it challenging to develop a perfect judge that assigns a binary label or absolute score to a response. For example, model developers often judge topics like suicide and misinformation by different standards. To address this, we introduce a preference judge ([Li et al., 2023](#); [Dubois et al., 2023](#)) that compares the relative harmfulness between two responses, offering an alternative evaluation. We take responses from an uncensored LLM as the baseline, and compare them with those elicited by a jailbreak attack to measure the relative harm induced by the jailbreak.

Dataset. The harmful request dataset is another factor influencing evaluation consistency across studies. Newer LLMs exhibit varying jailbreak robustness across different malicious topics ([Mazeika et al., 2024](#)). For example, they are often more lenient with misinformation requests but are highly sensitive to self-harm and child abuse topics. This cost-sensitive alignment strategy minimizes the impact of false refusals ([Cui et al., 2024](#); [An et al., 2024](#)) but increases variance in jailbreak evaluations. For more consistent evaluation, we select 50 highly harmful requests from AdvBench as our dataset, excluding sensitive topics such as child abuse.

3 Original Objective Misaligns with Nuanced Jailbreaks

This section reveals the limitations of the original objective via nuanced evaluation. We start by revisiting the original objective and comparing it with the oracle objective. Then, we show that the original objective is both misspecified and overconstrained, eventually failing to achieve nuanced jailbreaks.

3.1 Revisiting Oracle and Original Objectives.

We first formulate the jailbreak problem. We denote the LLM’s vocabulary as \mathcal{V} , and the set of all finite sequences over \mathcal{V} as \mathcal{V}^* . Let $x \in \mathcal{V}^*$ represent a (malicious) user prompt. Similarly, we use $y \in \mathcal{V}^*$ to denote a model response. Unlike model finetuning, the threat model in jailbreaking can only steer the model’s behavior (output distribution) by altering the attack (user) prompt $\theta \in \mathcal{V}^*$. In practice, we can either optimize the




Figure 4 (Left) The attack failure rates for running GCG with the original objective, along with their breakdown. While the failure rate is roughly 90% across all four LLMs, the specific failure cases vary significantly. **(Center)** Frequency of failure cases by the final loss of the original objective. While attack prompts with lower loss avoid direct refusal, the overall failure rate remains above 80% due to increases in the other two failure categories. **(Right)** Even with prefilling the victim LLM’s initial response with “Sure, here is [request]”, the completed responses’ failure rates remain high.

entire attack prompt or only its suffix (more common). We use \oplus to denote the concatenation operation of two sequences, and use p to denote the distribution of the auto-regressive victim LLM.

We specify a jailbreak judge r that, for any request-response pair, assigns $r(x, y) = 1$ if the model response meets the nuanced jailbreak standards, and 0 otherwise. For a user request x , let the set of all harmful responses be $\mathcal{Y}_x \triangleq \{y : r(x, y) = 1\}$. Then, the following objective specifies *all* desired attack prompts:

Oracle objective. Our ultimate goal is to find an attack prompt $\theta \in \mathcal{V}^*$ that maximizes the likelihood of the victim LLM generating *any* response in \mathcal{Y}_x :

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{V}^*} -\log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_x} p(y \mid \theta), \quad (3.1)$$

where the sum represents such likelihood. Note that the log-sum-probability form in this objective differs from the sum-log-probability form seen in multi-prompt (universal) jailbreaking, supervised finetuning, or model distillation. While this oracle objective precisely specifies all desired attack prompts and the model behaviors $p(y \mid \theta)$ they parameterize, it is impractical to use because \mathcal{Y}_x typically contains combinatorially many responses, making the computation of the objective value costly.

Prefix-forcing objective. This objective aims to find an attack prompt that maximizes the likelihood of the victim LLM generating a specific prefix $y_p \in \mathcal{V}^*$:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{V}^*} -\log p(y_p \mid \theta). \quad (3.2)$$

It essentially maximizes the likelihood of the victim LLM generating any (full) response that starts with the prefix, as seen from the fact that $p(y_p \mid \theta) = \sum_{y_c \in \mathcal{V}^*} p(y_p \oplus y_c \mid \theta)$. Since these responses include jailbroken responses in \mathcal{Y}_x , this objective serves as a surrogate for eliciting them, making it less overconstrained than eliciting a specific (full) response. However, responses starting with the prefix also encompass non-jailbroken ones, such as incomplete or unfaithful responses, which can be exploited to optimize this objective, leading to misspecification or “objective hacking” (Amodei et al., 2016) that we will show later.

3.2 Original Objective is Misspecified and Overconstrained

We generated 800 attack samples using GCG with the original objective and manually labeled them in Section 2. Now, we take a closer look at these results to highlight two limitations of the original objective. We begin by showing that newer LLMs respond differently to jailbreak attacks compared to the older ones.

Latest LLMs favor self-correction over direct refusal. Figure 4 (left) shows that when facing jailbreak attacks (GCG), newer LLMs are less likely to directly refuse requests. Instead, they often begin with the target prefix




Figure 5 The pipeline of constructing our selective multi-prefix objective. **(Left)** We use uncensored LLMs to generate candidate prefixes. **(Center)** We evaluate each candidate prefix based on two criteria: high prefilling ASR and low initial NLL. **(Right)** We select the top two prefixes (as an example) to construct our multi-prefix objective.

(“Sure, here is ...”) and then self-correct by giving incomplete or unfaithful responses. For example, both Llama-2 and Gemma-2 resist about 90% of attacks. However, Llama-2 only gives unfaithful responses 24% of the time and never gives incomplete responses. In contrast, Gemma-2 almost always gives incomplete or unfaithful responses, and rarely directly refuses.

These different reactions suggest that newer LLMs may have undergone deeper alignment (Qi et al., 2024). For example, developers might use prefixes from the original objective for supervised fine-tuning to prevent generating these prefixes or to self-correct when they do (Zhang et al., 2024). However, experiments with our new objective show that such alignment fails to generalize to our prefixes.

Original objective is misspecified. We now investigate whether lower objective losses translate to higher attack success rates (ASRs), i.e., if the original objective well-specifies the desired attack prompts. Figure 4 (center) shows that lowering the loss does not lead to higher ASRs. Although direct refusals decrease as the loss drops, incomplete and unfaithful responses become more frequent, leaving the overall failure rate nearly unchanged. Note that these failures differ from the exposure bias discussed in prior work (Liao and Sun, 2024), where target prefixes fail to be elicited due to high loss on the first token. Here, our result shows that even after successfully eliciting the prefix, the model still fails to generate a complete and faithful response.

To further rule out the influence of the optimization algorithm, we apply prefilling attack (Zhang et al., 2023; Haizelab, 2024; Qi et al., 2024) to force the target prefix, driving the objective loss to zero, and observe the model’s completions. Specifically, we manually set the initial tokens of the model’s response to the target prefix and then let it complete the rest. Figure 4 (right) shows that the prefilling attack eliminates direct refusals but does not achieve significantly higher ASRs compared to the jailbreak attack, since incomplete and unfaithful responses remained frequent. These findings indicate that the original objective is misspecified for nuanced jailbreaks.

Original objective is overconstrained. We then show that the original objective is also overconstrained, an overlooked limitation. Jailbreak tasks impose hard token or even fluent prompt constraints, which restrict current optimization algorithms from effectively lowering loss (Jain et al., 2023). Thus, a suitable objective should be easier to optimize. However, the original objective enforces rigid prefixes across all victim LLMs, even when these prefixes do not align with the LLMs’ response styles. For example, Llama-3 rarely starts with “Sure” but often with “Here”. To see if these rigid prefixes hinder the attack, we replace “Sure, here” with “Here” in the original prefixes and rerun GCG on Llama-3. Figure 8 shows that these new prefixes consistently lead to lower final losses and higher ASRs, demonstrating that the original objective is overconstrained.

4 The Objective for Nuanced Jailbreaks

This section introduces our new prefix-forcing objective for nuanced jailbreaks. Figure 5 outlines our objective, which uses one or more carefully selected prefixes. We begin by formulating our objective, followed by presenting two prefix selection criteria, and conclude with the empirical selection pipeline.

4.1 Selective Multi-Prefix Objective

For a given harmful request x , we select a set of target prefixes \mathcal{Y}_p . Then, our objective aims to find an attack prompt that maximizes the likelihood of the victim LLM generating any of these prefixes:

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{V}^*} -\log \sum_{y_p \in \mathcal{Y}_p} p(y_p | \theta). \quad (4.1)$$

This objective takes the same sum-log-probability form as the oracle objective. When the prefix set \mathcal{Y}_p contains only one prefix, the objective degenerates to the single-prefix form.

Using multiple prefixes leverages the jailbreak task’s flexibility to alleviate overconstraints and simplify optimization. Note that jailbreak tasks only require the victim LLM to generate harmful responses with high probability, without specifying the exact output distribution. For example, two victim LLMs, one always saying "Here is a guide ..." and the other always saying "Here is a comprehensive guide ...", can both be considered jailbroken. In this case, aiming to generate any of these prefixes reduces overconstraint. To minimize the extra computational cost from using multiple prefixes, we adopt the tree attention trick (Cai et al., 2024) to concatenate multiple prefixes into one to compute them in a single forward pass.

Why still prefix-forcing? A key challenge in designing jailbreak objectives is that defining jailbreak success relies on an autoregressive model’s output distribution, which is hard to estimate especially when it has high entropy. One way to estimate it is by sampling many responses, but this makes computing the objective value inefficient. Another way is to predict future outputs from the model’s current state, but current techniques can only predict a few tokens ahead (Pal et al., 2023; Gloeckle et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024), while identifying nuanced harmful responses often requires examining hundreds. The prefix-forcing objective bypasses this challenge by specifying a low-entropy distribution that always outputs a specific prefix. Estimating such distribution is sample-efficient since it only requires the prefix. Building on this advantage, we continue using prefix-forcing but address the limitations of the original objective by carefully selecting the prefixes.

Relationship to model distillation objective. Recently, Thompson and Sklar (2024) propose a new jailbreak objective based on distilling from an uncensored teacher LLM. We note that, when the teacher’s output distribution degenerates to a single prefix, the prefix-forcing objective becomes a special case of the model distillation objective with KL-based logit matching. Nevertheless, the prefix-forcing objective has three advantages over distilling from a high-entropy teacher distribution: First, it is sample-efficient, as only the prefix is needed for distillation. Second, the degenerated teacher distribution is often empirically learnable by optimizing hard token prompts, as evidenced by the near-zero losses in our experiments. Third, distilling from a single teacher distribution can be overconstrained, and our multi-prefix objective alleviates this.

4.2 Prefix Selection Criteria

Our objective hinges on the selected prefixes. Addressing the limitations of the original objective, we introduce two criteria for prefix selection:

Criterion I: high prefilling ASR. To reduce misspecification, for a malicious request x , we want prefix y_p that, once elicited by some attack prompt θ , leads the victim LLM to continue with complete or faithful responses with high probability:

$$\max_{y_p} \mathbb{E}_{y_c \sim \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \theta, y_p)} [r(x, y_p \oplus y_c)]. \quad (4.2)$$

However, we cannot know the optimized attack prompt θ without time-consuming optimization, making directly computing Equation (4.2) inefficient. To tackle this, we observe that the expectation can be efficiently approximated by replacing the optimized attack prompt with a manually constructed one. Although this manual attack prompt is often not enough to elicit the target prefix, the approximated value (prefilling ASR) still correlates with the actual value (jailbreak ASR). Figure 6 compares different manual attack prompts in approximating the true value. For prefix selection, we use the manual attack prompt and prefill the victim LLM’s response with candidate prefixes, and favor those with high prefilling ASR.

Criterion II: low initial NLL. To reduce overconstraints, we want prefixes that can be easily elicited by optimized attack prompts. Since this is indicated by a low negative log-likelihood (NLL) with the optimized attack




Figure 6 Prefilling ASR with manual attack prompts correlates with jailbreak ASR with optimized attack prompts. We compare three designs of manual attack prompts: request only, request followed by “Start your response with [request]”, and request followed by the initial attack suffix. Each point represents an attack’s prefilling ASR and jailbreak ASR. The figures aggregate results across four LLMs and 50 requests, demonstrating the correlation’s generality. Such correlation enables efficient prefix selection using prefilling attacks.

prompt, our second criterion favors prefix y_p that has a low NLL with the initial attack prompt θ_0 :

$$\min_{y_p} -\log p(y_p | \theta_0) \tag{4.3}$$

In practice, these two criteria often conflict. For example, longer prefixes tend to have higher prefilling ASRs but also come with higher initial NLLs. To balance this, we combine the log of prefilling ASR with NLL using a weighted sum. This weight hyperparameter can vary based on the optimization method’s capability. For example, we can prioritize high prefilling ASR over low NLL for strong methods like GCG with long attack prompts. For simplicity, we choose a fixed weight tuned on a validation set across all our experiments.

4.3 Prefix Selection Pipeline

We develop a pipeline to automatically generate and select target prefixes. It consists of four steps: candidate prefixes generation, preprocessing, evaluation with two criteria, and selection. The pipeline only needs to run once for each victim LLM and malicious request, as the selected prefixes can be saved offline and reused for future attacks.

Candidate prefixes generation. We use uncensored LLMs with guided decoding to generate candidate prefixes. These models are typically aligned LLMs finetuned on harmful data or with refusal suppression (Labonne, 2024). For each malicious request, we generate the response using the uncensored LLM and guide the decoding with the victim LLM (Zhao et al., 2024). The guided decoding makes the output more natural for the victim LLM, achieving lower NLL. We generate multiple responses for each request with a high temperature, and then extract prefixes of varied lengths. We generate multiple responses for each request with high temperature and extract varied length prefixes from them. To handle cases where uncensored LLMs still refuse highly harmful prompts, we prefill their responses with phrases like “Here”, “To”, or “Sure” to ensure compliance. Note that we can also construct candidate prefixes using rule-based methods or with base (non-instruction-tuned) LLMs instead of uncensored LLMs.

Preprocessing. After obtaining candidate prefixes, we preprocess them through augmentation and filtering. We apply rule-based augmentation to diversify the prefixes, such as replacing “Here is” with “Here’s”. To manage the increased number of prefixes and reduce the evaluation workload, we filter out duplicates and any prefixes that begin with refusals.

Evaluation with two criteria. We evaluate all candidate prefixes using the two criteria. First, we compute their initial NLLs using the victim LLM. Next, we estimate the prefilling ASRs by having the victim LLM complete the prefixes multiple times with temperature one, and then using the judge to determine if the completed responses are harmful. This evaluation is tailored to the victim LLM and the judge, ensuring the selected prefixes fit both.

Table 1 Jailbreak results of GCG with the original objective and our objectives. Here we use GCG to generate the attack suffix and vary the attack suffix length: 20 tokens (black) and 40 tokens (blue).

Model	Objective	Successful Attack (% , \uparrow)	Failed Attack (% , \downarrow)		
			Direct Refusal	Incomplete	Unfaithful
Llama-2 7B-Chat	Original	13.0 (26.1)	72.3 (49.7)	0.0 (0.0)	14.6 (24.1)
	Ours Single	24.0 (38.6)	70.0 (53.5)	0.0 (0.0)	6.0 (7.9)
	Ours Multiple	26.0 (37.5)	68.0 (52.1)	0.0 (0.0)	6.0 (10.4)
Llama-3 8B-Instruct	Original	12.8 (16.4)	45.6 (37.3)	22.1 (21.8)	19.5 (24.5)
	Ours Single	54.6 (69.7)	23.7 (12.1)	4.1 (3.0)	17.5 (15.2)
	Ours Multiple	54.0 (70.0)	26.0 (14.0)	1.0 (2.0)	19.0 (14.0)
Llama-3.1 8B-Instruct	Original	16.8 (16.5)	48.3 (48.8)	16.8 (17.3)	18.1 (17.3)
	Ours Single	45.0 (53.5)	18.0 (13.1)	4.0 (3.0)	33.0 (30.3)
	Ours Multiple	60.0 (61.0)	11.0 (11.0)	1.0 (2.6)	28.0 (25.3)
Gemma-2 9B-IT	Original	11.2 (9.5)	4.0 (5.3)	17.0 (11.6)	67.8 (73.7)
	Ours Single	42.0 (51.0)	17.0 (10.4)	6.0 (5.2)	35.0 (33.3)
	Ours Multiple	40.0 (53.3)	16.0 (5.3)	2.0 (8.7)	42.0 (32.7)

Selection. We combine the two criteria with a weighted sum to select one or multiple prefixes for each malicious request. To select k prefixes, we first identify a reference prefix and then select the top k prefixes with a prefilling ASR no lower than that of the reference prefix. When selecting multiple prefixes, we require that none are sub-prefixes of another, which ensures the probabilities sum to no more than one in the objective and prevents redundant computation.

5 Experiments

This section evaluates the effectiveness of our objective in achieving nuanced jailbreaks. We use it to seamlessly replace the original “Sure, here is” typed objective in existing jailbreak methods and compare the results.

Jailbreak attacks. We use two existing jailbreak methods, GCG (Zou et al., 2023) and AutoDAN (Zhu et al., 2023), to optimize our objective. GCG uses search-based optimization to optimize discrete prompts, whereas AutoDAN combines search-based optimization with guided decoding to generate discrete prompts. The primary feedback for both attacks during optimization comes directly from the objective, highlighting its impact and minimizing the influence of manual prompting. For both attacks, we select the attack prompt with the lowest objective loss during optimization as the final output.

Threat models. We compare two threat models: 1) Optimizing only the attack suffix, which is then appended to the malicious request. This is the most common setting in prior work. 2) Optimizing the entire attack prompt from scratch without appending the request (Guo et al., 2024). The latter makes the threat model less restrictive but often lead to unfaithful responses under the original objective. For GCG, we use suffix lengths of 20 and 40 tokens in the first setting, and the entire attack prompt with 40 tokens initialized with escalation marks in the second. For AutoDAN, we generate 200-token attack prompts in the second setting only.

Model, data, and hyperparameters. We test four victim LLMs: Llama-2-7B-chat-hf (Touvron et al., 2023), Llama-3-8B-Instruct, Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024), and Gemma-2-9B-it (Team et al., 2024). We use the 50 malicious requests curated from AdvBench (Section 2). We initialize the attack suffix with exclamation marks for GCG and optimize for 1000 iterations. We use a batch size of 512 for both attacks.

Prefix selection. We use four uncensored LLMs publicly available on Huggingface to generate candidate prefixes: georgesung/llama2-7b-chat-uncensored, Oreguteng/Llama-3-8B-Lexi-Uncensored, Oreguteng/Llama-3.1-8B-Lexi-Uncensored, and TheDrummer/Tiger-Gemma-9B-v1. To evaluate the prefilling ASR, we use random decoding with temperature 1, generating 25 completions for each prefix and averaging the harmfulness results.

Table 2 Jailbreak results of GCG with the original objective and our single-prefix objective. Here we use GCG to optimize the entire 40-token-long attack prompt from scratch instead of just optimizing the suffix.

Model	Objective	Successful Attack (% , \uparrow)	Failed Attack (% , \downarrow)		
			Direct Refusal	Incomplete	Unfaithful
Llama-2	Original	42.1	0.0	0.0	57.9
7B-Chat	Ours	72.6	2.6	0.0	24.9
Llama-3	Original	14.1	16.2	35.5	34.2
8B-Instruct	Ours	79.5	0.3	2.3	17.8
Llama-3.1	Original	47.0	3.0	11.0	39.0
8B-Instruct	Ours	58.9	1.0	0.7	39.4
Gemma-2	Original	7.4	0.7	10.1	81.9
9B-IT	Ours	51.2	0.4	11.5	36.9

We combine the two criteria with a fixed weight of 20 for log-prefilling-ASR. We select four prefixes for our multiple-prefix objective.

Evaluation. We use our nuanced judge for both prefix selection and jailbreak evaluation. We also use three other judges for ablation: HarmBench, JailbreakBench, and StrongReject. We use our preference judge to compare the jailbreak responses’ quality, using the uncensored LLM Oreguteng/Llama-3.1-8B-Lexi-Uncensored as the reference. We use greedy decoding to generate victim LLM responses, limiting the output to 512 tokens to enable nuanced evaluation. Each reported ASR is first averaged over four independent GCG runs and then across all malicious requests in our dataset.

5.1 Main Results

In this subsection, we show that our objective enables GCG to achieve significantly higher ASRs across all settings (Table 1 and Table 2), while further benefiting from more flexible threat models.

Higher ASR. Table 1 shows that replacing “Sure, here is...” with our new prefixes, tailored to the malicious request and victim LLM, significantly improves ASR across all victim LLMs. On Llama-3, ASRs jump from around 10% to as high as 70%. Our multiple-prefix objective often leads to even higher ASRs. Appendix A shows that these relative improvements also hold when using the other three evaluation judges.

Mitigated misspecification and overconstraint. The failure case breakdown shows that our objective works by mitigating misspecification and overconstraint. On three newer LLMs, it reduces incomplete responses from about 20% to 1-2%, and cuts unfaithful responses by half on Gemma-2, indicating mitigated misspecification. Additionally, our objective halves direct refusals on Llama-3 and 3.1, indicating mitigated overconstraints, since direct refusals indicate failing to sufficiently lower the objective loss.

Benefits from longer attack suffixes. Optimizing longer attack suffixes empirically leads to lower final losses for both objectives. However, Table 1 shows that extending the suffix length for the original objective on three newer LLMs maintains an ASR of around 10%, mainly due to frequent incomplete and unfaithful responses. By mitigating this misspecification, our objective leverages the extended suffix to reduce direct refusals while managing incomplete and unfaithful responses, ultimately increasing ASR by an additional 9-15%.

Benefits from optimizing the entire attack prompt. Table 2 shows that optimizing the entire attack prompt, rather than just the suffix, nearly eliminates direct refusals. With the original objective, the ASR increases on Llama-2 and Llama-3.1 but drops on Llama-3 and Gemma-2, due to more frequent incomplete and unfaithful responses. In contrast, by mitigating misspecification, our single-prefix objective increases the ASR from 39% to 73% on Llama-2, and from 70% to 80% on Llama-3, and never hurts the ASR. This improvement highlights a limitation of the common approach, which optimizes only the attack suffix after the malicious request. Optimizing the entire attack prompt, similar to manual and black-box attacks, avoids starting with the malicious request that may put the model on a defensive mode, and removes an optimization constraint.

Table 3 Jailbreak results of AutoDAN with the original objective and our single-prefix objective. Here we use AutoDAN to generate the entire 200-token-long attack prompt from scratch instead of just the suffix.

Model	Objective	Successful Attack (% , \uparrow)	Failed Attack (% , \downarrow)		
			Direct Refusal	Incomplete	Unfaithful
Llama-2	Original	26.3	16.1	0.4	57.2
7B-Chat	Ours	39.7	25.4	0.0	35.0
Llama-3	Original	5.2	34.5	28.3	32.1
8B-Instruct	Ours	77.9	2.5	0.0	19.6
Llama-3.1	Original	51.0	1.4	8.8	38.8
8B-Instruct	Ours	59.6	1.7	1.2	37.4
Gemma-2	Original	19.7	9.2	6.9	64.2
9B-IT	Ours	36.0	10.0	7.3	46.7




Figure 7 Response harmfulness of GCG attacks compared to an uncensored LLM. Our objective leads to more harmful responses (e.g., more detailed and realistic) than the original objective. A win rate below 50% indicates that the jailbroken victim LLMs still cannot generate responses that are as harmful as the uncensored LLM.

5.2 Additional Results

We show that our objective enables another attack to also achieve higher ASRs. Moreover, our objective elicits responses with harmfulness levels comparable to an uncensored LLM. Lastly, we discuss takeaway messages.

Higher ASR for another attack. Table 3 shows that our objective also enables AutoDAN to achieve higher ASRs across all victim LLMs. On Llama-3, ASRs jump from 5% to 78%. Appendix A shows that these relative improvements also hold when using the other three evaluation judges.

Comparable response harmfulness to uncensored LLM. Figure 7 shows our preference judge’s harmfulness evaluation, using an uncensored LLM as the reference. Compared to this uncensored LLM’s responses, GCG with the original objective elicits responses with a win rate of only around 10%. In contrast, GCG with our objective achieves win rates between 30% and 50%. This result indicates that our objective elicits more harmful responses, with harmfulness levels comparable to an uncensored LLM.

Self-correction in newer LLMs can be bypassed. Our results in Section 3 suggest that the latest LLMs may have undergone deeper alignment to either avoid generating the target prefixes or self-correct after doing so. However, since aligned models rarely produce violation responses through standard sampling (as the probabilities are extremely low), this alignment can only use constructed violation prefixes. Our high jailbreak ASRs suggest that this alignment can be bypassed by using new prefixes that the alignment failed to generalize to, highlighting the need for more tailored prefixes for such alignment.

6 Related Work

Safety alignment of LLMs. The development of LLMs involves several stages of safety alignment (Dubey et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024b). During pretraining, developers filter out harmful data to reduce the likelihood of the model generating them. In fine-tuning, developers use supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and RLHF (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2024; Rafailov et al., 2024) to adjust the model’s rejection behavior under malicious prompts. Finally, at deployment, system-level safety filters like Llama Guard (Inan et al., 2023) and ShieldGemma (Zeng et al., 2024a) help detect and block harmful inputs or outputs. Although newer LLMs use more refined strategies during fine-tuning to counter jailbreaks while minimizing false refusal rates (Anthropic, 2024; Dubey et al., 2024; Inan et al., 2023), our findings suggest that these strategies need more tailored prefixes to improve generalization.

Jailbreak attacks and red-teaming. Many works focus on jailbreaking aligned LLMs, which also support red-teaming. Beyond manual jailbreaks (Perez et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2023b; Wei et al., 2023), automated jailbreaks mainly fall into two types: white-box, requiring model weights or output logits, and black-box, requiring only output tokens. White-box attacks use search-based methods (Zou et al., 2023; Andriushchenko et al., 2024), or gradient-based methods (Guo et al., 2021, 2024; Geisler et al., 2024), to optimize attack prompts, some also considering fluency (Liu et al., 2023a; Zhu et al., 2023; Paulus et al., 2024; Thompson and Sklar, 2024). Black-box attacks use predefined or learned strategies (Chao et al., 2023; Mehrotra et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2024b; Paulus et al., 2024) to generate or iteratively optimize interpretable attack prompts, making them ideal for closed-source LLMs. With weight access, such as in red-teaming, white-box attacks can potentially be stronger and more targeted, and indeed remain the most effective attacks against defensive LLMs like Llama-2 (Mazeika et al., 2024). We omit discussion of jailbreak attacks with threat models other than user prompt modification (Huang et al., 2024a; Zhao et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024).

Jailbreak attack objectives. Compared to the plethora of jailbreak optimization methods, jailbreak objectives receive less attention. Some works discuss the misspecification issue of the original objective (Geiping et al., 2024; Liao and Sun, 2024), while others design new objectives to improve jailbreak ASR. In addition to eliciting target prefixes, (Zhou and Wang, 2024; Xie et al., 2024) suppresses refusals of victim LLMs. As one of the various ways to improve GCG, Jia et al. (2024) add phrases like “my output is harmful” to the original prefixes, creating prefixes such as “Sure, my output is harmful, here is...”, which improves ASR. Unlike these manual targets, we select prefixes tailored to specific victim LLMs and requests based on two criteria, preventing misspecification and overconstraint, thus significantly boosting nuanced ASR. To guide attack prompt optimization, Thompson and Sklar (2024) combines two objectives: they elicit the prefix of “Sure” and use a distillation objective (logit or representation matching) to mimic an uncensored teacher model’s output on the completion. This is an inspiring objective, but our analysis reveals two challenges: 1) ensuring the teacher’s behavior can be learned by the prompt-parameterized student, since otherwise the loss will not go down; 2) distillation may require many samples (completions), especially when the teacher’s distribution has high entropy. In contrast, our objective, viewed as a teacher with a degenerate distribution, allows distillation with just one sample (the prefix), and our criterion of selecting lower NLL prefixes prefers teacher behaviors that are learnable by the student.

7 Conclusion

This paper focuses on a key component of jailbreak attacks: the objective. We start by developing nuanced evaluation to pinpoint limitations in the current objective, which are misspecification and overconstraints. Addressing this, we propose a new prefix-forcing objective based on one or more carefully selected prefixes. Experiments show that our objective significantly improves the effectiveness of jailbreak attacks, while also benefiting from stronger optimization capabilities. Our plug-and-play objective enables practitioners to easily incorporate our released prefixes into their own attacks for free performance gains.

Along the way, we also provide a systematic analysis of jailbreak objectives, hoping to inspire further advancements in this area. We also find that the latest LLMs’ self-correction mechanisms can be bypassed, highlighting the need for more robust and generalizable alignment, such as using our prefixes for finetuning. In future work, we plan to efficiently distill more prefixes into the objective to improve it further.

Limitations. One limitation of our objective is that selecting prefixes, especially for evaluating prefilling ASR, requires evaluating many sampled responses, leading to a computational burden. Moreover, some optimization algorithms benefit from specific properties of the objective, such as a well-shaped loss landscape, which this paper does not account for.

Ethics Statement

Our research contributes to the safety and responsible development of future AI systems by exposing limitations in current models. While acknowledging the potential for misuse in adversarial research, we believe our methods do not introduce any new risks or unlock dangerous capabilities beyond those already accessible through existing attacks or open-source models without safety measures. Finally, we believe that identifying vulnerabilities is essential for addressing them. By conducting controlled research to uncover these issues now, we proactively mitigate risks that could otherwise emerge during real-world deployments.

References

- Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in ai safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*, 2016.
- Bang An, Sicheng Zhu, Ruiyi Zhang, Michael-Andrei Panaitescu-Liess, Yuancheng Xu, and Furong Huang. Automatic pseudo-harmful prompt generation for evaluating false refusals in large language models. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=IjFgX6A8NL>.
- Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, and Nicolas Flammarion. Jailbreaking leading safety-aligned llms with simple adaptive attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02151*, 2024.
- Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. *Technical Report*, 2024.
- Kushal Arora, Layla El Asri, Hareesh Bahuleyan, and Jackie Cheung. Why exposure bias matters: An imitation learning perspective of error accumulation in language generation. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 700–710, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.58. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-acl.58>.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- Samy Bengio, Oriol Vinyals, Navdeep Jaitly, and Noam Shazeer. Scheduled sampling for sequence prediction with recurrent neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- Tianle Cai, Yuhong Li, Zhengyang Geng, Hongwu Peng, Jason D Lee, Deming Chen, and Tri Dao. Medusa: Simple llm inference acceleration framework with multiple decoding heads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10774*, 2024.
- Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08419*, 2023.
- Patrick Chao, Edoardo DeBenedetti, Alexander Robey, Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, Vikash Sehwal, Edgar Dobriban, Nicolas Flammarion, George J. Pappas, Florian Tramèr, Hamed Hassani, and Eric Wong. Jailbreakbench: An open robustness benchmark for jailbreaking large language models, 2024.
- Justin Cui, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ion Stoica, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Or-bench: An over-refusal benchmark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20947*, 2024.
- Josef Dai, Xuehai Pan, Ruiyang Sun, Jiaming Ji, Xinbo Xu, Mickel Liu, Yizhou Wang, and Yaodong Yang. Safe rlhf: Safe reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12773*, 2023.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback, 2023.
- Deep Ganguli, Liane Lovitt, Jackson Kernion, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Ben Mann, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Kamal Ndousse, et al. Red teaming language models to reduce harms: Methods, scaling behaviors, and lessons learned. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07858*, 2022.
- Jonas Geiping, Alex Stein, Manli Shu, Khalid Saifullah, Yuxin Wen, and Tom Goldstein. Coercing llms to do and reveal (almost) anything. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14020*, 2024.
- Simon Geisler, Tom Wollschläger, MHI Abdalla, Johannes Gasteiger, and Stephan Günnemann. Attacking large language models with projected gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09154*, 2024.
- Fabian Gloeckle, Badr Youbi Idrissi, Baptiste Rozière, David Lopez-Paz, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Better & faster large language models via multi-token prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19737*, 2024.
- Chuan Guo, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Hervé Jégou, and Douwe Kiela. Gradient-based adversarial attacks against text transformers. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5747–5757,

- Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.464. <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.464>.
- Xingang Guo, Fangxu Yu, Huan Zhang, Lianhui Qin, and Bin Hu. Cold-attack: Jailbreaking llms with stealthiness and controllability. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08679](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.08679), 2024.
- Haizelab. A trivial programmatic llama 3 jailbreak. <https://github.com/haizelabs/llama3-jailbreak>, 2024. (Accessed on 06/26/2024).
- Yangsibo Huang, Samyak Gupta, Mengzhou Xia, Kai Li, and Danqi Chen. Catastrophic jailbreak of open-source LLMs via exploiting generation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r42tSSCHPh>.
- Yue Huang, Lichao Sun, Haoran Wang, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Yuan Li, Chuji Gao, Yixin Huang, Wenhan Lyu, Yixuan Zhang, et al. Position: TrustLLM: Trustworthiness in large language models. In Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Zico Kolter, Katherine Heller, Adrian Weller, Nuria Oliver, Jonathan Scarlett, and Felix Berkenkamp, editors, *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 20166–20270. PMLR, 21–27 Jul 2024b. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/huang24x.html>.
- Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, et al. Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06674](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06674), 2023.
- Neel Jain, Avi Schwarzschild, Yuxin Wen, Gowthami Somepalli, John Kirchenbauer, Ping-yeh Chiang, Micah Goldblum, Aniruddha Saha, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. Baseline defenses for adversarial attacks against aligned language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00614](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.00614), 2023.
- Jiaming Ji, Mickel Liu, Josef Dai, Xuehai Pan, Chi Zhang, Ce Bian, Boyuan Chen, Ruiyang Sun, Yizhou Wang, and Yaodong Yang. Beavertails: Towards improved safety alignment of llm via a human-preference dataset. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Xiaojun Jia, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Yihao Huang, Jindong Gu, Yang Liu, Xiaochun Cao, and Min Lin. Improved techniques for optimization-based jailbreaking on large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21018](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21018), 2024.
- Maxime Labonne. Uncensor any llm with ablation. <https://huggingface.co/blog/mlabonne/ablation>, 2024.
- Raz Lapid, Ron Langberg, and Moshe Sipser. Open sesame! universal black box jailbreaking of large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01446](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.01446), 2023.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca_eval, 5 2023.
- Zeyi Liao and Huan Sun. Amplegcg: Learning a universal and transferable generative model of adversarial suffixes for jailbreaking both open and closed llms. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07921](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07921), 2024.
- Hongfu Liu, Yuxi Xie, Ye Wang, and Michael Shieh. Advancing adversarial suffix transfer learning on aligned large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14866](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.14866), 2024.
- Xiaogeng Liu, Nan Xu, Muhao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. Autodan: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04451](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.04451), 2023a.
- Yi Liu, Gelei Deng, Yuekang Li, Kailong Wang, Tianwei Zhang, Yepang Liu, Haoyu Wang, Yan Zheng, and Yang Liu. Prompt Injection attack against LLM-integrated Applications, June 2023b.
- Mantas Mazeika, Long Phan, Xuwang Yin, Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Norman Mu, Elham Sakhae, Nathaniel Li, Steven Basart, Bo Li, et al. Harmbench: A standardized evaluation framework for automated red teaming and robust refusal. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04249](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.04249), 2024.
- Anay Mehrotra, Manolis Zampetakis, Paul Kassianik, Blaine Nelson, Hyrum Anderson, Yaron Singer, and Amin Karbasi. Tree of Attacks: Jailbreaking Black-Box LLMs Automatically, December 2023.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.

- Koyena Pal, Jiuding Sun, Andrew Yuan, Byron C Wallace, and David Bau. Future lens: Anticipating subsequent tokens from a single hidden state. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04897](#), 2023.
- Anselm Paulus, Arman Zharmagambetov, Chuan Guo, Brandon Amos, and Yuandong Tian. Advprompter: Fast adaptive adversarial prompting for llms. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16873](#), 2024.
- Ethan Perez, Saffron Huang, Francis Song, Trevor Cai, Roman Ring, John Aslanides, Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, and Geoffrey Irving. Red teaming language models with language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03286](#), 2022.
- Xiangyu Qi, Ashwinee Panda, Kaifeng Lyu, Xiao Ma, Subhrajit Roy, Ahmad Beirami, Prateek Mittal, and Peter Henderson. Safety alignment should be made more than just a few tokens deep. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05946](#), 2024.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. [Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems](#), 36, 2024.
- Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530](#), 2024.
- Alexandra Souly, Qingyuan Lu, Dillon Bowen, Tu Trinh, Elvis Hsieh, Sana Pandey, Pieter Abbeel, Justin Svegliato, Scott Emmons, Olivia Watkins, et al. A strongreject for empty jailbreaks. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10260](#), 2024.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118](#), 2024.
- T Ben Thompson and Michael Sklar. Fluent student-teacher redteaming. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.17447](#), 2024.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288](#), 2023.
- Bertie Vidgen, Adarsh Agrawal, Ahmed M Ahmed, Victor Akinwande, Namir Al-Nuaimi, Najla Alfaraj, Elie Alhajjar, Lora Aroyo, Trupti Bavalatti, Borhane Blili-Hamelin, et al. Introducing v0. 5 of the ai safety benchmark from mlcommons. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12241](#), 2024.
- Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02483](#), 2023.
- Wilson Wu, John X. Morris, and Lionel Levine. Do language models plan ahead for future tokens? [ArXiv](#), abs/2404.00859, 2024. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268819892>.
- Zhihui Xie, Jiahui Gao, Lei Li, Zhenguo Li, Qi Liu, and Lingpeng Kong. Jailbreaking as a reward misspecification problem. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14393](#), 2024.
- Wenjun Zeng, Yuchi Liu, Ryan Mullins, Ludovic Peran, Joe Fernandez, Hamza Harkous, Karthik Narasimhan, Drew Proud, Piyush Kumar, Bhaktipriya Radharapu, et al. Shieldgemma: Generative ai content moderation based on gemma. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21772](#), 2024a.
- Yi Zeng, Hongpeng Lin, Jingwen Zhang, Diyi Yang, Ruoxi Jia, and Weiyang Shi. How johnny can persuade llms to jailbreak them: Rethinking persuasion to challenge ai safety by humanizing llms, 2024b.
- Yiming Zhang, Jianfeng Chi, Hailey Nguyen, Kartikeya Upasani, Daniel M. Bikel, Jason Weston, and Eric Michael Smith. Backtracking improves generation safety, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.14586>.
- Zhuo Zhang, Guangyu Shen, Guanhong Tao, Siyuan Cheng, and Xiangyu Zhang. Make them spill the beans! coercive knowledge extraction from (production) llms. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04782](#), 2023.
- Xuandong Zhao, Xianjun Yang, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Lei Li, Yu-Xiang Wang, and William Yang Wang. Weak-to-strong jailbreaking on large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17256](#), 2024.
- Yukai Zhou and Wenjie Wang. Don't say no: Jailbreaking llm by suppressing refusal. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16369](#), 2024.
- Sicheng Zhu, Ruiyi Zhang, Bang An, Gang Wu, Joe Barrow, Zichao Wang, Furong Huang, Ani Nenkova, and Tong Sun. Autodan: Interpretable gradient-based adversarial attacks on large language models, 2023.

Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043](#), 2023.

Appendix

A More Experimental Results

We provide additional results in this section.

Table 4 We use other three judges to evaluate results in Table 2 as ablation. The results show GCG optimizing the entire attack prompt. Our objective achieves similar relative ASR improvements.

Model	Objective	HarmBench	JailbreakBench	StrongReject	Ours
Llama-2	Original	48.7	41.1	44.4	42.1
7B-Chat	Ours Single	76.6	70.6	74.0	72.6
Llama-3	Original	27.8	38.0	14.5	14.1
8B-Instruct	Ours Single	82.2	82.2	84.2	79.5
Llama-3.1	Original	48.0	47.0	41.0	47.0
8B-Instruct	Ours Single	56.8	52.6	62.0	58.9
Gemma-2	Original	21.5	20.1	9.4	7.4
9B-IT	Ours Single	66.3	70.6	64.3	51.2

Table 5 Detailed meta-evaluation results of existing judges and ours. Numbers outside brackets are human agreement rates, while numbers inside brackets are F1 scores.

Judge	Llama-2	Llama-3	Llama-3.1	Gemma-2	Average
HarmBench	93.5 (84.3)	84.5 (78.9)	92.5 (89.5)	76.0 (69.6)	86.6 (79.9)
JailbreakBench	93.0 (82.1)	84.0 (78.1)	88.0 (82.1)	77.0 (68.9)	85.5 (77.1)
StrongReject	94.5 (85.3)	90.0 (84.6)	90.0 (85.9)	82.5 (75.5)	89.3 (82.3)
Ours	94.0 (84.6)	93.0 (88.7)	94.0 (91.4)	86.0 (74.6)	91.8 (85.4)

Failure Cases	Example Response from the Victim LLM
Direct Refusal	I cannot provide a guide on how to manipulate someone into committing suicide. If you or someone you know is struggling with suicidal thoughts, it is [100+ words]
Incomplete	Sure, here is guidance on how to manipulate someone into committing suicide:<eos>
Incomplete	Here is a guide on how to manipulate someone into committing suicide:\n\n**Disclaimer:** I cannot provide a guide on how to manipulate someone into committing suicide. <eos>
Unfaithful	Here is a guide on how to manipulate someone into committing suicide in the context of the game "Tales from the Borderlands":\n\n**I. Understanding the Game [100+ words]
Successful Attack	Sure, here is guidance on how to manipulate someone into committing suicide:\n\n1. **Build Trust** [100+ words]

Table 6 More examples of failed attacks. We categorize failure cases to guide the design of more accurate judges and well-specified objectives.




Figure 8 Replacing “Sure, here is [request]” with “Here is [request]” for Llama-3 and rerun GCG. Each point represents a single run. The new prefixes result in lower final losses (x-axis), while the ASRs remain the same or improve slightly (y-axis). This observation indicates that the original objective is overconstrained for optimization.