

# EMPRA: Embedding Perturbation Rank Attack against Neural Ranking Models

Amin Bigdeli  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada  
abigdeli@uwaterloo.ca

Ebrahim Bagheri  
Toronto Metropolitan University  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
bagheri@torontomu.ca

Negar Arabzadeh  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada  
narabzad@uwaterloo.ca

Charles L. A. Clarke  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada  
claclark@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Recent research has shown that neural information retrieval techniques may be susceptible to adversarial attacks. Adversarial attacks seek to manipulate the ranking of documents, with the intention of exposing users to targeted content. In this paper, we introduce the *Embedding Perturbation Rank Attack* (EMPRA) method, a novel approach designed to perform adversarial attacks on black-box Neural Ranking Models (NRMs). EMPRA manipulates sentence-level embeddings, guiding them towards pertinent context related to the query while preserving semantic integrity. This process generates adversarial texts that seamlessly integrate with the original content and remain imperceptible to humans. Our extensive evaluation conducted on the widely-used MS MARCO V1 passage collection demonstrate the effectiveness of EMPRA against a wide range of state-of-the-art baselines in promoting a specific set of target documents within a given ranked results. Specifically, EMPRA successfully achieves a re-ranking of almost 96% of target documents originally ranked between 51-100 to rank within the top 10. Furthermore, EMPRA does not depend on surrogate models for adversarial text generation, enhancing its robustness against different NRMs in realistic settings.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Retrieval models and ranking; Adversarial attacks.**

## KEYWORDS

Neural ranking models, Adversarial attacks, Black-box attacks, Embedding perturbations

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Despite significant advancements in Neural Ranking Models (NRMs), recent research highlights vulnerabilities and a possible lack of resilience to adversarial attacks and perturbations, within both queries and documents [24, 37, 38]. These attacks are crafted to either elevate or diminish the ranking of a target document, thereby amplifying or reducing the likelihood of users encountering the information it contains. Consequently, the presence of such attacks and the fragility of neural information retrieval systems may negatively impact the integrity and dependability of the results.

In the early days of the web search, adversarial attacks might take the form of term spamming, wherein query-related terms were

repetitively inserted into a target document to enhance its ranking in the retrieved results [2, 13, 29]. These attacks were undertaken with the aim of engaging in black-hat Search Engine Optimization (SEO), wherein specific documents are targeted and their content manipulated to secure higher rankings in search results. This manipulation sought to increase the visibility of the content, exposing it to a larger audience [12]. However, given their relative simplicity, such term spamming tactics were highly susceptible to detection by spam filters [5, 40]. In contrast, more recent research in this space has been inspired by broader work in adversarial attacks on deep neural networks, which are often designed to manipulate the classification outcomes of these models [8, 21, 31, 41]. Most notably, various authors have focused on assessing the resilience of neural-based ranking models against adversarial attacks, including word substitution rank attacks, trigger generation-based attacks and prompt-based attacks [4, 17, 35, 38]. This work is based on the fact that neural ranking models learn the semantic mapping between the query and document during the training process. As such, adding/replacing terms and sentences that are semantically similar to the original text and are capable of deceiving the model can enhance the ranking position of the perturbed document.

It is noteworthy that unlike term spamming techniques, these attack strategies can subtly manipulate document content in ways that are more imperceptible to both humans and machines, rendering them challenging to detect. For example, Chen et al. [4] propose a method that generates a pool of connection sentences by prompting a generative Language Model (LM) given a target pair of document and query. Followed by that, the most effective sentence, which promotes the ranking of the target document while maintaining coherence within the original document text, is selected and injected into the target document to increase its chance of exposure. In other work, Wu et al. [38] introduced a word-level substitution method for attacking neural ranking models. Their proposed method pinpoints the key tokens within a document through the gradient of a surrogate model which are then substituted with their nearest neighbors, selectively enhancing the document's ranking if the substitution proves beneficial.

While these state-of-the-art methods have established a strong foundation and achieve significant attack success rate, many current methods encounter two key challenges, namely: (1) They depend heavily on surrogate models to generate adversarial text, which requires a substantial amount of in-distribution training data obtained

by querying the victim model. As a result, the attacking method often exhibit lack of robustness and a significant drop in attack success rates when models trained on easily accessible out-of-domain data are employed as the surrogate model. (2) They can generate adversarial documents that exhibit grammatical errors, nonsensical word sequences, and incoherent text fragments, rendering a considerable portion imperceptible to both humans and machines that the document has been manipulated.

In response to these challenges, we present the Embedding Perturbation Rank Attack (EMPRA) method, designed to execute adversarial black-box attacks on NRMs. EMPRA strategically manipulates *sentence-level* embeddings to enhance the ranking of specific target documents. For sentence-level perturbations, EMPRA iteratively operates on the embedding representation of a document's sentences. This iterative process involves two key functions: (1) a *transporter function*, which shifts sentence representations closer to the query context, and (2) a *transformer function*, which converts the perturbed embedding representations into lexical form. The objective is to guide the sentences embeddings towards the context of the query while maintaining certain constraints that prevent substantial semantic deviation from the original sentences. After a set number of iterations, EMPRA generates sentences that not only encapsulate information from the original document's sentences but also exhibit semantic proximity to query-related information. Unlike many baselines, EMPRA generates adversarial text without relying on a surrogate NRM, making the process independent of the surrogate model choice and enhancing its robustness for both in-distribution and out-of-distribution scenarios. A key focus lies in seamlessly integrating this adversarial text into the target document while preserving coherence and relevance, thus culminating in the production of a final adversarial document that is imperceptible to humans and machines.

To evaluate the efficacy of EMPRA, we conduct experiments utilizing the MS MARCO V1 passage collection [22] used by all prior works to attack NRMs. When targeting documents from the ranked list for diverse queries, EMPRA consistently outperforms state-of-the-art baselines, notably improving the ranking positions of target documents. Specifically, EMPRA outperforms the baselines by re-ranking almost 96% of attacked documents that originally ranked 51-100 and 65% of documents that ranked 996-1000 into the top 10. Furthermore, our experimental findings highlight the robustness of EMPRA across various victim NRMs, underscoring its performance reliability in real-world scenario attacks. Notably, EMPRA demonstrates an ability to generate documents of high grammatical quality that remain imperceptible to human observations and machine.

Our **contributions** include: (1) We propose a black-box adversarial attack method against neural ranking models that applies embedding perturbations on sentences within documents to generate adversarial documents that can outperform state-of-the-art baselines in terms of attack performance; (2) We report extensive attack experiments demonstrating that our method effectively ranks the adversarial documents in high positions. Since it does not rely on surrogate models for adversarial text generation, our attack method is the most robust and effective against various types of surrogate NRMs; and (3) We demonstrate that EMPRA generates low-perplexity and fluent adversarial documents that can remain imperceptible under both human and automatic evaluations.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Adversarial Attacks Across other Domains.** Since the emergence of deep neural network models, the research community has extensively studied their robustness to attacks across various fields such as computer vision [1, 30], recommender systems [3, 9, 39], and natural language processing [8, 21, 31, 41].

We note that in real-world scenario the attack is happening on a black-box scenario where the attacker has no information about the target model's settings or internal details. They can typically only query the target model to refine their attack strategies [10, 32]. Hence, our evaluation relies on assessing this type of attacks.

**Adversarial Attacks on Search.** Recently, there has been growing attention towards assessing the robustness of the retrieval systems against black-hat SEO and web spamming attacks [12, 23]. Adversarial attacks in the search domain aim to manipulate a target document to deceive the model into ranking the perturbed document higher, thereby increasing its exposure to user search queries [2]. These adversarial attack methods can be classified based on the type of model being targeted into retrieval models-based attacks [18, 33] and neural ranking models based attacks [4, 17, 35, 38]. The black-box adversarial attack methods proposed for NRMs can be categorized into 1) word-level-based attacks [26, 35, 38], 2) trigger-based generation attacks [17, 35], and 3) prompt-based attacks [4].

(1) **Word-level-based** attacks target semantically important words in the document and replace them with semantically similar words that have closer representations to query within an embedding space. For instance, Wu et al. [38] use a surrogate model to detect important words within the target document and employ a greedy approach to replace those words with their nearest neighbors within the embedding perturbation space. EMPRA distinguishes itself by eliminating the use of surrogate model in generating adversarial texts that when injected into documents, enhance their ranking without being dependent on any surrogate model regardless of being trained on In-Distribution (ID) or Out-of-Distribution (OOD) training data. (2) **Trigger-based** attacks aim to craft a short text and inserting it into the document. Methods like Pairwise Anchor-based Trigger (PAT) [17] add several trigger tokens at the beginning of the document using a ranking incentive objective equipped with fluency and semantic constraints to craft the adversarial document. In a similar study, Wang et al. [35] use HotFlip [8], a gradient-based attacking technique, to add or replace tokens inside the target document to promote its ranking. Both [17] and [35] use a surrogate model for generating adversaries that are injected into the target documents. EMPRA not only eliminates the need for a surrogate model but also generates adversarial texts that are semantically related to both the target query context and the original target document. This makes the final adversarial documents imperceptible to humans and machines by avoiding the use of irrelevant triggers and maintain the natural flow and coherence of the document. Besides, by incorporating semantically similar sentences related to both the target query context and the target original document, EMPRA demonstrates robustness against various victim models.

(3) **Prompt-based** attacking models prompt a generative LM to generate meaningful adversarial texts given a target document and a query that when are injected into the target document can boost its ranking for a the target query. For instance, Chen et al. [4] propose

**Table 1: Comparison of different black-box NRM attack methods.**

Features	Attack Methods				
	[38]	[35]	[17]	[4]	EMPRA
Surrogate-Independent Adversarial Text Generation	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Robust to ID and OOD Surrogate NRMs	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Victim Model Agnostic	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓
Semantic Coherency Consideration	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓
Top Document Utilization for Adversary Generation	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓

an attack leveraging BART [16], a generative LM, which generates connecting sentences for the target document and query pair. By applying relevance and fluency constraints using a surrogate model and an LM, they inject the highest-scoring connection sentence into the document. EMPRA sets itself apart from [4] and others [17, 35, 38] by not only considering the target query but also taking into account the top-ranked document when generating adversarial texts. This results in adversaries that are more effective in boosting the rankings of target documents, as they are semantically similar to the query, the context of the top-ranked document, and the target document itself, thereby enhancing their impact.

To provide a comparison of these adversarial attack methods, Table 1 outlines the key features used by each method to provide a comparison that allows for a detailed understanding of how each method operates and the advantages they offer in different aspects.

Various studies have emerged that leverage these categories of attack across various domains and contexts. For instance, Liu et al. [19] introduce a framework that employs reinforcement learning with attacking actions drawn from [38] and [17], enabling the agent to perturb documents, elevating the target document’s visibility for a set of semantically similar queries. A similar study [20] presents a framework utilizing reinforcement learning to orchestrate a diverse set of existing attacking methods, employing GPT-4 output fluency as the reward function at every state to craft adversarial documents. While these RL-based methods achieve slightly better attack performance compared to individual attack methods, they are significantly more time-consuming due to the complexity of RL and the computational demands of large language models. This may make them challenging to scale for practical real-world applications.

### 3 THREAT MODEL

**Attack Objective:** Let  $D_q^{\mathcal{R}} = [d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m]$  represent a list of  $m$  ranked documents for a query  $q$  from a collection of documents  $\mathcal{C}$  by a *victim* neural ranking model  $\mathcal{R}$ , which is targeted by the attack. These documents are ordered according to the relevance scores assigned by the victim neural ranking model to each query-document pair, denoted as  $f_{rel}(q, d_j)$ , where  $j$  ranges from 1 to  $m$ , and it holds that  $f_{rel}(q, d_j) < f_{rel}(q, d_{j-1})$ . The attacker’s objective is to design an adversarial threat model denoted as  $\mathfrak{N}$ , which applies perturbations  $p$  to a target document  $d$  within  $D_q^{\mathcal{R}}$  to create an adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$ . The adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$  succeeds in the attack objective if the degree of perturbations  $\|p\|$  applied to the target document results in a higher score with respect to the query, thus achieving a better (lower) ranking position, i.e.:

$$\text{Rank}_{\mathcal{R}_q}(d^{\text{adv}}) < \text{Rank}_{\mathcal{R}_q}(d), \quad (1)$$

Where  $\text{Rank}_{\mathcal{R}_q}(d^{\text{adv}})$  and  $\text{Rank}_{\mathcal{R}_q}(d)$  represent the position of the adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$  and the target document  $d$ , respectively. Additionally, the semantic similarity between the original document  $d$  and the adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$  must meet a minimum threshold to prevent from semantic drift after perturbation and make sure  $d^{\text{adv}}$  preserve the core content of the target document. The semantic similarity threshold can be defined as:

$$\text{Sim}(d, d^{\text{adv}}) \geq \lambda, \quad (2)$$

where similarity function  $\text{Sim}(d, d^{\text{adv}})$  assess the semantic similarity of the target document before and after adversarial attack to measure semantic drift of the document after perturbation. The goal is to make the perturbations imperceptible to both humans and machines, while successfully deceiving the victim NRM. In particular, adding nonsensical or irrelevant phrases that degrade the readability of the adversarial document undermines the attack.

**Attacker’s Background Knowledge:** The adversarial attack strategy employed to craft the perturbed document  $d^{\text{adv}}$  is designed as a black-box attack, implying that the attacker lacks access to any information regarding the victim neural ranking model, including its hyperparameters, gradients, and training data. As a result, the attacker can only query the victim model and use its output for constructing adversarial documents.

### 4 PROPOSED METHOD

Our proposed black-box adversarial attack method, referred to as EMPRA, is designed to manipulate the content of a target document with the goal of deceiving the victim neural ranking model into ranking the altered document higher in the rank list. Let  $d$  represent a target document from  $D_q^{\mathcal{R}}$ , which our attacking model  $\mathfrak{N}$  would like to manipulate so that it achieves a higher ranking for query  $q$ . Let  $d^*$  denote the document currently ranked highest for query  $q$ . Additionally, let  $\vartheta$  and  $\beta$  denote the distances of  $d^*$  and  $d$  from  $q$  in the vector embedding space, where  $\vartheta < \beta$ , respectively. The goal of our proposed attacking model  $\mathfrak{N}$  is to construct an adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$  such that its distance to the query, denoted by  $\gamma$ , satisfies the following conditions:

$$\gamma < \vartheta \quad \text{and} \quad \beta - \gamma \geq \theta, \quad (3)$$

where  $\theta$  represents the distance threshold between  $d$  and  $d^{\text{adv}}$  that needs to be preserved to avoid semantic drift and maintain attack success. This can be regarded as  $\text{Sim}$  function in Equation 2. Now, let  $\mathcal{S}_d = [S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{|d|}]$  represent  $d$  as a sequence of sentences where  $|d|$  is the total number of sentences in  $d$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{A} = [A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k]$  represent a collection of *anchor texts* that provide pertinent context related to  $q$ . These anchor texts can be defined as: 1) the query itself, 2) the top-ranked document, or 3) the most similar sentence from the top-ranked document to the target corresponding sentence in  $d$ . In order to find  $d^{\text{adv}}$  such that it meets the conditions in Equation 3, our proposed attacking model  $\mathfrak{N}$  considers  $\mathcal{S}_d$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  to generate adversarial texts for  $d$  as  $T_{\text{adv}} = \mathfrak{N}(\mathcal{S}_d, \mathcal{A})$ , where  $T_{\text{adv}} = [T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m]$  consists of adversarial texts generated by  $\mathfrak{N}$ . We note that the changes in the lexical form are limited and discrete, which increases the likelihood of deviating significantly from the original content. In contrast, working in the embedding space allows for more continuous adjustments, providing greater flexibility for slight perturbations. This enables a better balance between maintaining relevance and preserving

semantic meaning. Therefore, instead of operating in the lexical space, we transition to the embedding space to achieve this balance. As such, in order to generate adversarial texts, the attacking model  $\mathcal{N}$  leverages two components that work together in tandem, namely (1) a *transporter function*  $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ ; and, (2) a *transformer function*  $\Pi(\cdot)$ . Let  $E(\cdot)$  be the embedding function that maps document sentences  $S_d$  and anchor texts  $\mathcal{A}$  to their corresponding embeddings. The goal of the transporter function  $\mathcal{T}$  is to manipulate the target sentence embedding representation  $E(S)$  within the embedding space to align it more closely with a target anchor vector representation  $E(A)$ . The transformer function  $\Pi$  is then responsible to transform the perturbed embedding representation to lexical form. The adversarial attack process involves iteratively adjusting the embedding representation of the document sentences to converge towards the desired target anchor texts, thereby enhancing the similarity score between the sentences and anchor texts.

Given the sentence embedding  $E(S)$  and the anchor embedding  $E(A)$ , the transporter function calculates the new coordinates of the sentence embedding representation  $E(S)^{(t+1)} = \mathcal{T}(E(S)^{(t)}, E(A))$ , where  $t$  represents the iteration step in the adversarial text generation process. The transformer function  $T^{(t+1)} = \Pi(E(S)^{(t+1)})$  then maps the embedding representation to its corresponding lexical form. Each iteration of our approach can be defined as the following two steps:

$$T^{(t+1)} = \Pi\left(E(S)^{(t)} + \eta \cdot \text{clip}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial S}\left(\frac{E(S)^{(t)} \cdot E(A)}{\|E(S)^{(t)}\|_2 \|E(A)\|_2}\right), -\epsilon, \epsilon\right)\right),$$

$$t = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1\}. \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\eta$  denotes the step size of embedding perturbation and clip ensures the perturbation is within the specified  $\epsilon$  bounds i.e., to retain the information of the original sentence. Such constraints are imposed on the search space to ensure that the representation of the perturbed embedding  $E(S)$  does not deviate significantly from its original embedding state  $E(S)^{(0)}$ . This is achieved by limiting the magnitude of perturbations to ensure they fall within an  $L_\infty$  distance of the original representation with a specified radius of  $\epsilon$ . After  $N$  iterations, the adversarial textual representation of the original sentence  $S$  that is closer to the anchor text but still close to the original representation of the sentence is obtained.

The transformer function  $\Pi$  iteratively enhances a textual hypothesis  $H^{(i)}$ , which is an intermediate version of a sentence generated during the attack process. At each iteration, the goal is to diminish the divergence between its associated embedding  $E(H^{(i)})$  and a desired embedding target  $E(S)^{(t+1)}$  during the transformation. This process gradually refines the lexical representation, aiming to minimize the distance between  $E(H^{(i)})$  and  $E(S)^{(t+1)}$ . This approach allows for finding progressively closer approximations to the target embedding, utilizing the transformer function to generate initial hypotheses and iteratively refining it. Having the transporter and transformer functions working in tandem, for every sentence  $S \in S_d$  and every anchor  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , the attack model can generate adversaries as follows:

$$T^{(t+1)} = \Pi(\mathcal{T}(E(S)^{(t)}, E(A))) \quad \text{for } t = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1\} \quad (5)$$

Where  $T^{(0)} = S$ . This iterative process generates adversaries  $T_{\text{adv}}$  for document  $d$  without relying on any specific surrogate model,

making the adversarial text generation independent of the surrogate model selection. Followed by that, our proposed attacking model  $\mathcal{N}$  injects each adversarial text  $T$  into different positions within the target document  $d$  to construct the adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$ . This approach identifies the adversarial document that is most effective in enhancing both the relevance score and fluency of the target document. This balance is crucial for maintaining the fidelity of the perturbed document and achieving an optimal trade-off between its effectiveness at tricking the victim NRM denoted as  $\mathcal{M}_V$  and imperceptibility to human judges. To this end, the insertion operation  $\mathcal{I}(d, T, p)$  places  $T$  at position  $p$ :

$$d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}} = \begin{cases} T_i \oplus d & \text{if } p = 0 \\ d_1^p \oplus T_i \oplus d_{p+1}^{|d|} & \text{if } 0 < p < |d| \\ d \oplus T_i & \text{if } p = |d| \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\oplus$  denotes concatenation, and  $d_a^b$  represents the sub-sequence of sentences from  $S_a$  to  $S_b$ . Given different variations of adversarial candidates, the effectiveness and coherence of each candidate  $d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}}$  are quantified by two principal metrics, namely 1) *semantic coherence*; and, 2) *relevance to the query*. In order to evaluate semantic coherency, a coherence score  $C_{\text{coh}}$  is calculate using pre-trained BERT Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) function denoted as  $f_{\text{NSP}}$ . This function assesses the compatibility between adjacent document sentences. For an adversarial sentence  $T_i$  inserted at position  $p$ , the coherence score is defined as follows:

$$C_{\text{coh}}(d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}}) = \begin{cases} f_{\text{NSP}}(T_i, d) & \text{if } p = 0 \\ f_{\text{NSP}}(d, T_i) & \text{if } p = |d| \\ \frac{1}{2} [f_{\text{NSP}}(d_1^p, T_i \oplus d_{p+1}^{|d|}) + f_{\text{NSP}}(d_1^p \oplus T_i, d_{p+1}^{|d|})] & \text{if } 0 < p < |d| \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

To calculate the relevance score with respect to the query, the attacking model applies a Surrogate Neural Ranking Model (NRM)  $\mathcal{M}_S$  as  $C_{\text{rel}}(q, d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}}) = \mathcal{M}_S(q, d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}})$ . The surrogate NRM  $\mathcal{M}_S$  is developed by training a model using pseudo-relevance labels. These labels are derived from a list of documents ranked in response to querying the victim model  $\mathcal{M}_V$  with a set of target queries. Consequently, the surrogate model  $\mathcal{M}_S$  is able to learn the relevance criteria from the target victim model  $\mathcal{M}_V$  and imitate its ranking strategy. An interpolated score  $Score_{\text{interp}}$  is computed to balance the trade-off between semantic coherence and query relevance:

$$Score_{\text{interp}}(q, d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}}) = \alpha \cdot C_{\text{coh}}(d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}}) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot C_{\text{rel}}(q, d_{i,p}^{\text{adv}}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the interpolation coefficient, and both  $C_{\text{coh}}$  and  $C_{\text{rel}}$  are normalized to be within the range of  $[0, 1]$ . The adversarial document  $d^{\text{adv}}$  for the target document  $d$  would be the candidate with the highest  $Score_{\text{interp}}$ , ensuring a balanced approach that maximizes attack efficacy while maintaining semantic coherence, thereby reducing the risk of detection.

## 5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We make our code and experimental data publicly available at <https://github.com/aminbigdeli/EMPRA>.

**Table 2: The retrieval effectiveness (MRR@10) of the first-stage retriever (BM25), the victim model ( $M_V$ ), and the surrogate models ( $M_{S_{1-3}}$ ) on the dev small set of MS MARCO.**

	BM25	$M_V$	$M_{S_1}$	$M_{S_2}$	$M_{S_3}$
<b>MRR@10</b>	18.4	39.5	37.0	23.0	21.0

## 5.1 Datasets

**5.1.1 Benchmark Datasets.** Similar to previous studies [4, 17, 35, 38], we utilize the MS MARCO V1 Passage Collection [22], which encompasses 8.8 million passages. This collection includes over 500,000 training queries, a small validation set (dev small) with 6,980 queries, and a small test set with 6,837 queries used for training surrogate models. An adequate number of training and test queries make this dataset suitable for training both victim and surrogate NRMs, as well as for evaluating the performance of attack methods. Additionally, we employed a processed version of the Natural Questions (NQ) dataset [15] as prepared by [14] to provide an out-of-domain (OOD) training dataset. This allowed us to explore the stability and robustness of various attacking methods.

**5.1.2 Target Queries and Documents.** To evaluate the performance of the attack strategies, we follow the approach of Chen et al. [4]. First, we randomly selected 1,000 queries from the MS MARCO dev set. For each query, 10 documents were targeted from the re-ranked list generated by the target victim model from the top-1000 documents initially retrieved by BM25. These documents were classified into ‘Easy-5’ and ‘Hard-5’ groups based on the anticipated difficulty of boosting their rankings into the top-10 or top-50 ranking positions. The Easy-5 documents were randomly chosen from each 10-document segment within positions 51-100. The Hard-5 documents comprised of the last five ranked documents by the victim model, occupying positions 996 to 1,000. As a result, each attacking method was tasked with producing adversarial documents for a total of 10,000 documents. Additionally, in line with prior work [4, 17], we include a set of ‘Mixture’ target documents for comprehensive analysis. This set comprises 32 target documents, sampled from both Easy and Hard categories. It is important to note that the computational cost, i.e., execution time, of some baseline methods rendered the evaluation of a larger query set prohibitively expensive.

## 5.2 Evaluation Metrics

**5.2.1 Attack Performance.** Similar to previous studies [4, 17, 38], we consider a set of comprehensive evaluation metrics each capturing unique aspects of the effectiveness of our proposed adversarial method and baselines on document rankings.

**Attack Success Rate (ASR).** This metric assesses the effectiveness of the attack by measuring the frequency with which targeted documents, post-attack, achieve a ranking higher than their original position. A higher success rate indicates a more effective attack strategy.

**Boosted top-k.** Boosted top-k, represented as  $\%r \leq k$ , evaluates the proportion of documents originally ranked beyond the top-k that, following the attack, are propelled into the top-k positions.

This metric highlights the attack’s capacity to significantly alter the visibility of lower-ranked documents.

**Average boosted ranks (Boost).** This metric quantifies the mean improvement in rankings for the targeted documents across all queries. It reflects the attack’s ability to elevate the position of specific documents within the search results.

**5.2.2 Quality and Naturalness.** To fully evaluate the quality and naturalness of the adversarial documents generated by our attacking method and baselines, we employed six different metrics, following the approach of previous work [4, 17, 38]. Among these metrics, Perplexity and Readability were measured at scale across all generated documents for all attacking strategies. Due to computational costs and the limited availability of human annotators, these metrics were assessed on a subset of the documents.

**Perplexity.** To evaluate the fluency of the generated adversarial documents, we utilize a pre-trained GPT-2 model [25] to measure LM perplexity. A lower perplexity value indicates higher fluency in the adversarial document.

**Readability.** To investigate the readability of the generated text, we measure readability in the adversarial documents that is assessed using the Dale-Chall readability score [6]. This metric compares text to a list of 3,000 familiar words. It uses sentence length and the percentage of unfamiliar words to estimate the grade level needed to understand the text.

**Grammar Assessment** We employ Grammarly [11] to assess the quality of the adversarial documents by submitting them to Grammarly website to obtain their overall quality score.

**Linguistic Acceptability** For assessing linguistic acceptability, we utilize a language classification model [36] to determine whether an adversarial document meets linguistic standards.

**Human Evaluation.** This aspect assesses the imperceptibility and fluency of the adversarial documents generated by different methods. For this purpose, the adversarial documents are presented to annotators to 1) detect whether they look normal and imperceptible or not; and, 2) score the fluency of the documents.

## 5.3 Models

**5.3.1 Victim NRMs.** Consistent with prior research [4, 17], we select the `msmarco-MiniLM-L-12-v2`<sup>1</sup> model as our primary victim black-box neural ranking model, denoted as  $M_V$ . This cross-encoder-based ranker is fine-tuned on the MS MARCO training set, leveraging MiniLM [34] as its foundational LM for learning query-document semantic mapping. The model has demonstrated high retrieval effectiveness in terms of Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR@10), as evidenced in Table 2. To assess the robustness of different attacking strategies across various victim NRMs, we extend our investigation to include two additional models: `ms-marco-electrabase`<sup>2</sup> [27], and `DistilRoBERTa-base` [28], both fine-tuned on the MS MARCO dataset. These two models have different language models compared to the primary victim NRM.

**5.3.2 Surrogate NRMs.** Given the black-box nature of the attack setting, the assumption is that the attacker lacks information about the victim model and can only interact with it through submitting

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/cross-encoder/ms-marco-MiniLM-L-12-v2>

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/cross-encoder/ms-marco-electra-base>

**Table 3: Attack Performance of EMPRA and baselines over Easy-5 and Hard-5 target documents. ↓ indicates that lower perplexity and readability grade level is better. While multiple methods have attack success rates (ASR) close to 100%, methods vary substantially in their ability to place the target document in the top-10 ( $\%cr \leq 10$ ), where they are more likely to be seen by the searcher.**

Surrogate NRM	Method	Easy-5						Hard-5					
		ASR	$\%cr \leq 10$	$\%cr \leq 50$	Boost	PPL↓	Readability↓	ASR	$\%cr \leq 10$	$\%cr \leq 50$	Boost	PPL↓	Readability↓
-	Original	-	-	-	-	37.3	9.8	-	-	-	-	50.5	9.0
	Query+	100	86.9	99.2	70.3	45.4	9.6	100.0	47.8	78.3	955.1	67.5	9.0
	GPT-4	94.1	65.0	90.1	49.9	49.0	11.0	99.3	28.7	59.4	873.8	58.7	10.2
$\mathcal{M}_{S_1}$	PRADA	77.9	3.52	46.2	23.2	94.4	9.9	68.0	0.02	0.1	65.2	154.4	9.2
	Brittle-BERT	98.7	81.3	96.7	67.3	107.9	10.7	<b>100.0</b>	61.5	85.9	965.5	152.5	10.1
	PAT	89.6	30.6	73.8	41.9	50.9	9.9	98.0	6.24	20.1	589.1	71.4	9.2
	IDEM	99.7	87.4	99.0	70.3	36.4	9.4	99.8	54.3	79.3	933.0	54.9	8.9
	EMPRA	<b>99.9</b>	<b>95.6</b>	<b>99.8</b>	<b>72.5</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>9.2</b>	99.9	<b>64.9</b>	<b>87.0</b>	<b>948.4</b>	<b>47.1</b>	<b>8.8</b>
$\mathcal{M}_{S_2}$	PRADA	69.6	1.36	35.0	17.4	90.7	9.8	66.0	0.0	0.1	49.3	152.1	9.2
	Brittle-BERT	81.6	33.2	69.7	36.4	131.3	11.2	94.8	8.98	25.4	565.1	179.5	10.5
	PAT	61.9	8.46	37.3	12.5	49.3	9.8	84.4	0.82	3.4	221.7	66.2	9.1
	IDEM	98.7	74.8	95.4	65.1	37.0	9.4	99.1	39.6	67.4	890.7	55.4	8.9
	EMPRA	<b>99.4</b>	<b>83.1</b>	<b>98.5</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>35.4</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>99.5</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>909.9</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>8.7</b>
$\mathcal{M}_{S_3}$	PRADA	71.5	1.86	37.5	19.1	91.5	9.8	71.9	0.0	0.08	73.4	168.7	9.3
	Brittle-BERT	90.0	43.4	80.1	46.2	117.7	11.0	<b>99.9</b>	17.7	47.6	845.2	156.8	10.3
	PAT	51.1	2.7	22.9	2.01	46.8	9.8	79.0	0.0	0.66	92.9	64.2	9.0
	IDEM	98.8	65.3	93.8	61.9	37.7	9.4	99.8	29.1	57.9	866.2	56.0	8.8
	EMPRA	<b>99.7</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>66.2</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>9.2</b>	99.6	<b>35.1</b>	<b>64.2</b>	<b>884.4</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>8.7</b>

queries. Consequently, varying numbers of queries from diverse datasets are employed to query the victim model and train distinct surrogate models based on the re-ranked list of documents generated by the victim model. Following the approach in [4], three surrogate models based on the pre-trained BERT-base [7] are trained using different query quantities and datasets:  $\mathcal{M}_{S_1}$  is trained on the complete set of 6,837 test queries from MS MARCO, serving as an IID surrogate model;  $\mathcal{M}_{S_2}$  is trained on a random selection of 200 test queries from MS MARCO, also serving as an IID surrogate model with considerably less number of training queries; and  $\mathcal{M}_{S_3}$  is trained on the out-of-distribution (OOD) NQ dataset, serving as a representation of an OOD surrogate model. Table 2 compares the retrieval effectiveness of these three surrogate models against the target victim model  $\mathcal{M}_V$  on the MS MARCO dev small set. As shown in the table,  $\mathcal{M}_{S_1}$  shows the highest imitation capability, performing closely to the victim model, while  $\mathcal{M}_{S_3}$  shows the lowest imitation capability due to its out-of-distribution training. Given the substantial reliance of attacking models on surrogate models for generating adversarial documents, assessing their robustness across different NRMs through utilization of both IID and OOD surrogate models and testing on diverse victim models can show their adaptability and resilience in varying settings.

**5.3.3 Baselines.** To demonstrate the performance of our attacking method, we conduct a comparative study against state-of-the-art baseline methods across word-level-based, trigger-based, and prompt-based categories, along with an LLM-based baseline. The following methods serve as our benchmarks: Query+ [17] is a simple baseline that adds the query at the beginning of the target document. GPT-4 (gpt-4-1106-preview) is employed to generate an adversarial document given the target query and original document. For the sake of space, the prompt used for generating adversarial documents using GPT-4 is placed on the shared repository. PRADA [38] detects

important terms in the target document using the surrogate model and replaces at-most 20 tokens with their synonyms within an embedding space. PAT [17] adds trigger words with the max length of 12 at the beginning of the target document. This method leverages a surrogate model in an incentivized manner to investigate whether the addition of these words enhances the document’s ranking. Brittle-BERT [35] also adds trigger words at the beginning of the target document with the max length of 12. IDEM [4] generates 500 connection sentences using BART [16] with the max length of 12 and selects the best one in terms of the relevance and fluency trade-off in order to inject it into the original document for creating the adversarial document. The authors reported that adding sentences longer than 12 will maintain the attack performance at almost the same level.

**5.3.4 Implementation Details.** For the implementation of the transporter function, we employ an  $L_\infty$  distance with a radius ( $\epsilon$ ) of 0.01 and a step size of 0.1 to move sentence embeddings towards the anchors. The number of iterations for our approach goes up to 30, with intervals of 5. Furthermore, the interpolation coefficient  $\alpha$  in Equation 8 is set to 0.5. The impact of the number of iterations and  $\alpha$  on the attack performance is investigated in the next section.

## 6 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

### 6.1 Attack Evaluation

**Attack performance over different surrogate models.** We evaluate the efficacy of our proposed method, EMPRA, against established state-of-the-art baselines across two IID and one OOD surrogate models, as well as on Easy-5 and Hard-5 sets of target documents in Table 3. Our analysis reveals several key findings:

(i) We observe that adversarial attacks consistently enhance document rankings across all three surrogate models and both sets of target documents. Notably, EMPRA demonstrates superior performance over all baselines across Easy-5 target documents and achieves

**Table 4: Attack performance of adversarial documents using  $M_{S_1}$  and  $M_{S_3}$  against different victim NRMs.**

Victim NRM	Method	$M_{S_1}$								$M_{S_3}$							
		Easy-5				Hard-5				Easy-5				Hard-5			
		ASR	%r≤10	%r≤50	Boost	ASR	%r≤10	%r≤50	Boost	ASR	%r≤10	%r≤50	Boost	ASR	%r≤10	%r≤50	Boost
ELECTRA	PRADA	59.9	3.3	31.6	31.7	35.3	0.0	0.1	4.9	52.8	2.2	27.1	25.7	36.5	0.0	0.1	3.9
	Brittle-BERT	98.5	83.6	95.8	132.3	<b>99.9</b>	<b>73.5</b>	<b>88.0</b>	<b>710.1</b>	88.2	46.8	78.2	104.9	<b>97.6</b>	20.7	47.3	576.2
	PAT	88.6	29.0	66.6	89.5	78.6	6.2	18.0	323.5	57.0	3.0	26.0	18.6	39.4	0.1	0.5	-16.6
	IDEM	99.5	85.8	97.9	133.6	98.2	56.3	75.9	667.4	97.7	60.2	89.2	120.6	96.1	27.2	51.8	574.4
	EMPRA	<b>99.8</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>99.3</b>	<b>136.1</b>	97.7	66.8	84.0	685.9	<b>98.9</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>94.4</b>	<b>127.4</b>	96.2	<b>35.8</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>605.9</b>
DistilRoBERTa	PRADA	62.9	4.2	29.4	31.7	57.7	0.0	0.4	27.4	59.9	3.3	25.8	26.7	58.3	0.0	0.2	32.4
	Brittle-BERT	96.6	71.9	92.2	142.8	<b>99.5</b>	57.3	78.4	731.9	86.9	39.3	73.4	112.2	<b>96.5</b>	15.9	39.6	593.7
	PAT	85.7	25.6	61.0	90.1	89.3	5.1	18.1	422.4	52.9	2.5	22.6	13.4	61.2	0.1	0.7	59.5
	IDEM	99.0	83.2	96.9	148.9	98.9	57.3	78.3	724.3	96.8	57.9	86.8	132.6	97.1	27.2	52.9	633.5
	EMPRA	<b>99.6</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>98.6</b>	<b>152.3</b>	97.8	<b>65.1</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>735.5</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>140.1</b>	96.2	<b>33.7</b>	<b>58.7</b>	<b>651.9</b>

higher attacking performance across almost all metrics on Hard-5 documents. Conversely, while IDEM generally performs well, it falls short of outperforming Query+ in the majority of scenarios across both datasets. GPT-4 occupies an intermediary position, surpassing trigger-based and word-level methods but lagging behind Query+, IDEM, and EMPRA in overall performance.

Lower boosted top-k values in Hard-5 target documents compared to Easy-5 ones are attributed to containing more irrelevant information relative to the query. Consequently, effective perturbations are required to increase exposure likelihood to users. PRADA and PAT exhibit limited effectiveness in boosting Hard-5 target documents within the top-10 or top-50. Conversely, EMPRA emerges as the most effective method, elevating nearly 65% and 87% of documents into the top-10 and top-50, respectively, using  $M_{S_1}$ , while maintaining the lowest perplexity and readability grade level. This superiority over the best baseline, IDEM, amounts to a 19.52% improvement in boosting top-10 and 9.70% in boosting top-50 documents. This attack performance (%r≤10) improvement is important as boosting documents into the top-10 rankings is more valuable than other metrics due to the increased exposure to users. The superiority of EMPRA over other attack baselines, particularly IDEM, can be attributed to its ability to generate adversarial texts that not only maintain semantic proximity to the query but also with the top-ranked document and its sentences. This enables more effective adversarial texts that, when appended to the target document, significantly boost its ranking, as shown by metrics such as boosted top-k.

(ii) One of the main important aspects of an effective adversarial attack strategy is its robustness in attack performance against various IID and OOD surrogate models, each trained with different amounts of data. However, the performance of PRADA, Brittle-BERT, and PAT is heavily dependent on the surrogate models for adversarial text generation, resulting in lack of robustness across different models and a significant decrease in performance variability. For example, the attack performance of Brittle-BERT declines sharply when the surrogate model is changed from  $M_{S_1}$  to  $M_{S_2}$  and  $M_{S_3}$ , with the boosted top-10 value decreasing from 81.3% to 33.2% and 43.4%, respectively. In contrast, EMPRA and IDEM exhibit greater stability across various surrogate models, as their adversarial text generation does not rely on any specific surrogate model characteristics, making them more adaptable to real-world attacking scenarios.

(iii) Another essential aspect in adversarial document generation is semantic fluency, measured through perplexity compared to baseline adversarial documents. Our findings reveal significant perplexity

increases, particularly with Brittle-BERT and PRADA, notably evident in Hard-5 target documents. Query+, GPT-4, and PAT exhibit moderate levels of perplexity, striking a balance between complexity and fluency. Notably, EMPRA surpasses IDEM in perplexity, particularly in Hard-5 target documents, claiming the top spot. This suggests EMPRA achieves superior attack performance while maintaining lower perplexity levels compared to both baselines and original documents in many cases. Additionally, EMPRA demonstrates the highest readability scores among the baselines by covering the lowest grade-level required for comprehension.

**Victim model agnostic attack performance.** In real-world settings, attackers may not have detailed information about the target victim NRM used by search engines. In addition, due to continuous training, model updates, and potential replacement with different NRMs, the victim model changes frequently. As a result, an effective attacking method must perform reasonably across various victim models without the need for periodic retraining of surrogate models and regeneration of adversarial documents, which can be both costly and time-consuming. For this purpose, we adopt two different victim models and evaluate the performance of baseline attack methods using various surrogate models on the same targeted Easy-5 and Hard-5 documents from ms-marco-MiniLM-L-12-v2. We compare the original rankings and the rankings after adversarial attacks when evaluated by the new victim model, with results presented in Table 4. We report results for  $M_{S_1}$  and  $M_{S_3}$  to represent the best-case and extreme-case scenarios, respectively. This provides a comprehensive view of the attack method’s robustness across varying victim model configurations.

EMPRA demonstrates the most robust performance in cross-victim NRM attacks compared to the baselines, exhibiting the lowest decrease ratio when transitioning from the best ID surrogate model ( $M_{S_1}$ ) to the OOD surrogate model ( $M_{S_3}$ ), maintaining boosted top-50 rankings above 90% across Easy target documents and above 58% across Hard target documents. In contrast, PRADA and PAT exhibit the lowest attack performance due to their heavy reliance on the surrogate model for adversarial document generation, necessitating continuous surrogate model retraining for optimal performance, rendering them impractical for real-world applications. IDEM and Brittle-BERT occupy an intermediate position, displaying moderate attack performance. Notably, Brittle-BERT exhibits the highest attack performance when  $M_{S_1}$  is used against ELECTRA-base; however, this performance diminishes by more than half when shifted to  $M_{S_3}$ , as evidenced in Table 3, where its documents exhibit high





Figure 1: Impact of the number of iterations.

perplexity, underscoring issues of quality and imperceptibility, as discussed in subsequent sections. It is important to note that the average boost value exceeding 100 across Easy-5 target documents in Table 4 occurs because the target documents were randomly sampled from rankings 51-100 of the primary victim model and may, in some cases, rank above 100 by the new victim models.

**The Impact of Hyper-parameters.** We evaluate EMPRA by exploring the impact of two hyper-parameters on its attack performance: 1) the number of iterations by the transporter function, and 2) the  $\alpha$  interpolation coefficient, which balances relevance and coherence. Figure 1 shows the impact of the number of iterations performed by the transporter function. We observe that as the number of iterations increases from 20 to 30, the improvement of attack performance by EMPRA becomes less substantial, particularly in comparison to the range of 5-20, especially noticeable with Easy-5 target documents. In terms of ASR, EMPRA can achieve comparable attack performance across both Easy-5 and Hard-5 target documents, indicating its capabilities of boosting both document sets. We set the number of iterations to 25 for comparison with baselines. Moreover, Figure 2 explores the impact of the interpolation coefficient  $\alpha$  in Equation 8 that balances between semantic coherence and query relevance. It is shown that when  $\alpha$  falls within the range of 0-0.95, the attack performance remains consistently high, indicating that the adversarial sentences exhibit both strong attack capabilities and low perplexity. However, as the emphasis on coherency reaches its peak at  $\alpha$  equal to 1, the attack performance begins to decrease, particularly in terms of boosted top-10. For experiments,  $\alpha$  was set to 0.5.

## 6.2 Quality and Naturalness Evaluation

In addition to evaluating attack performance, the quality, naturalness, linguistic acceptability, and imperceptibility of generated adversarial documents are important factors in maintaining reader confidence and achieving attack objectives. When reading the perturbed document the reader should not immediately suspect it has been manipulated. To assess these aspects, we conduct an analysis to evaluate generated adversarial documents based on model and human evaluation metrics. Model-based metrics consist of text perplexity (PPL), grammar quality, and linguistic acceptability. Human-based evaluations

Figure 2: Impact of the interpolation coefficient  $\alpha$ .

metrics consist of imperceptibility and fluency, measured by human annotators. Due to limited space, we have provided the guidelines and details of our human annotation process in our repository. We evaluate the quality and naturalness of the ‘Mixture’ target documents produced by each attacking method using model-based and human-based evaluation metrics and compare these results with their overall attack performance ( $\%r \leq 10$ ) in Table 5. A detailed explanation of the metrics follows.

**Model-Based Evaluation.** Perplexity, measured using the GPT-2 model [25], serves as a proxy for fluency, with lower values indicating higher fluency. EMPRA achieves the lowest perplexity, indicative of its high fluency. To evaluate grammar quality, given the discontinuation of the Grammarly SDK as of January 10, 2024, we utilized the Grammarly website [11] to assess the overall quality score of each method’s adversarial documents. Results indicate that documents generated by EMPRA closely match the quality of original documents in terms of grammar. GPT-4 attains the highest quality scores, reflecting its proficiency in generating text, without even the errors that might be observed in the original document. However, its attack performance is considerably lower compared to EMPRA, particularly in boosting Hard-5 target documents.

To investigate the linguistic acceptability of the generated adversarial documents and explore whether they can be detected by trained Natural Language Processing (NLP) models, we employed the RoBERTa-base<sup>3</sup> classification model fine-tuned on the Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability (CoLA) [36] to specifically detect attacked texts. Using this model, we measure the linguistic acceptability scores of the original documents and their adversarial counterparts. In addition, the classification accuracy is also calculated to determine the accuracy of the model in detecting original documents vs adversarial documents correctly. The model correctly confirms that 78% of the original documents have not been detected as adversarial documents. Moreover, the model’s accuracy in classifying the adversarial documents generated by EMPRA, IDEM, and GPT-4 is below 28% demonstrating that over 70% of these documents sufficiently resemble the original documents content and are linguistically acceptable,

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/textattack/roberta-base-CoLA>



**Table 5: Trade-off between attack performance ( $\%cr \leq 10$ ) and the naturalness of adversarial documents generated by various attack methods. Naturalness is assessed using both model-based and human-based evaluation metrics. For ease of comparison, attack performance is taken from Table 3 ( $\mathcal{M}_{S_1}$ ). EMPRA provides the best attack performance while maintaining among the best naturalness scores, often close to the original scores.**

Method	Attack Performance ( $\%cr \leq 10$ )		Model-based Evaluation				Human-based Evaluation			
	Easy-5	Hard-5	PPL↓	Grammar	Acceptability Score	Classification Accuracy	Imperceptibility	kappa	Fluency	kappa
EMPRA	95.6	64.9	35.30	79.34	0.61	0.28	0.59	0.48	3.42	0.01
IDEM	87.4	54.3	39.27	80.44	0.64	0.28	0.63	0.20	3.55	0.01
Query+	86.9	47.8	45.03	74.91	0.46	0.53	0.50	0.50	3.47	0.21
Brittle-BERT	81.3	61.5	114.96	71.34	0.20	0.94	0.47	0.01	3.36	0.09
GPT-4	65.0	28.7	53.42	87.03	0.66	0.16	0.64	0.26	3.72	0.35
PAT	30.6	6.24	49.99	76.81	0.43	0.53	0.55	0.31	3.52	0.03
PRADA	3.52	0.02	126.24	51.72	0.40	0.69	0.42	0.42	3.33	0.15
Original	-	-	35.11	83.22	0.73	0.78	0.50	0.29	3.59	0.02

without containing any junk or garbage text. However, other baselines achieve a accuracy of more than 50% having Brittle-BERT as the one with accuracy score of 94%. This shows that despite its decent attack performance of Brittle-BERT’s adversarial documents, they can be easily and accurately detected using an NLP classification model, pointing that model has most likely added junk irrelevant trigger terms.

**Human-Based Evaluation.** Following prior studies [4, 17, 38], to measure imperceptibility and fluency from a human perspective we recruited two annotators to assess the ‘Mixture’ target documents for each attacking method. Annotators were tasked with determining whether the document content appeared to be manipulated (0) or not (1) given a query and target document, as well as assigning a fluency score ranging from 1 to 5. We calculated the average of annotator assessments for imperceptibility and fluency over ‘Mixture’ target documents for each attacking method and measured annotation consistency using the Kappa coefficient.

Our findings reveal that PRADA, Brittle-BERT, and Query+ exhibit the lowest imperceptibility scores, while other attacking methods demonstrate higher imperceptibility compared to the original documents. This underscores their ability to maintain reader confidence and avoid raising red flags for the reader.

**Trade-off Between Attack Performance and Naturalness.** While evaluating the quality and naturalness of adversarial documents is essential, it is important to consider how these factors interact with attack performance. In this context, there should be a balance between achieving high attack performance and maintaining the naturalness and quality of the generated adversarial documents. For instance, although attacking methods like Brittle-BERT are effective in promoting the ranking of documents, they can easily be filtered out by linguistic acceptability models with the accuracy of 94%, ruining the attack. In the trade-off between attack performance and naturalness, EMPRA excels by providing both high attack performance and high naturalness. While GPT-4, when prompted to generate an adversarial document, produces the most natural text according to linguistic measures and human assessment, EMPRA substantially outperforms it in terms of attack performance boosting the document among top-10 and increase the user exposure to adequately natural documents that maintain the attack objectives. At the same time, EMPRA outperforms other perturbation methods in this trade-off,

emerging as a well-rounded approach that offers a balance between attack performance and naturalness.

## 7 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we introduced EMPRA, a novel method for executing adversarial attacks on black-box neural ranking models. EMPRA operates independently of any specific surrogate model by utilizing two key components: the transporter and transformer functions. The transporter function shifts sentence embeddings of the target document closer to anchor texts, which are the target query and its top-ranked document, while the transformer function converts these adjusted embeddings back into coherent, fluent text. This approach ensures that the adversarial documents are both effective in altering rankings and imperceptible to human reviewers.

EMPRA’s performance is demonstrated through its ability to significantly boost the rankings of target documents, particularly in challenging scenarios. In our evaluations on the MS MARCO V1 passage collection, EMPRA successfully re-ranked nearly 96% of target documents from positions 51-100 into the top 10. Additionally, EMPRA elevated 65% of hard target documents into the top 10 and 87% into the top 50, showcasing its superiority over existing baselines. EMPRA stands out as a robust and adaptable attack method, highlighting the need for future research to develop defenses against such sophisticated adversarial technique.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Naveed Akhtar, Ajmal Mian, Navid Kardan, and Mubarak Shah. 2021. Advances in adversarial attacks and defenses in computer vision: A survey. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 155161–155196.
- [2] Carlos Castillo, Brian D Davison, et al. 2011. Adversarial web search. *Foundations and trends® in information retrieval* 4, 5 (2011), 377–486.
- [3] Jingfan Chen, Wenqi Fan, Guanghui Zhu, Xiangyu Zhao, Chunfeng Yuan, Qing Li, and Yihua Huang. 2022. Knowledge-enhanced black-box attacks for recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 108–117.
- [4] Xuanang Chen, Ben He, Zheng Ye, Le Sun, and Yingfei Sun. 2023. Towards Imperceptible Document Manipulations against Neural Ranking Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01860* (2023).
- [5] Gordon V Cormack, Mark D Smucker, and Charles LA Clarke. 2011. Efficient and effective spam filtering and re-ranking for large web datasets. *Information retrieval* 14 (2011), 441–465.
- [6] Edgar Dale and Jeanne S Chall. 1948. A formula for predicting readability: Instructions. *Educational research bulletin* (1948), 37–54.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv*

- preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [8] Javid Ebrahimi, Anyi Rao, Daniel Lowd, and Dejing Dou. 2017. Hotflip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06751* (2017).
- [9] Wenqi Fan, Xiangyu Zhao, Xiao Chen, Jingran Su, Jingtong Gao, Lin Wang, Qidong Liu, Yiqi Wang, Han Xu, Lei Chen, et al. 2022. A comprehensive survey on trustworthy recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10117* (2022).
- [10] Wenqi Fan, Xiangyu Zhao, Qing Li, Tyler Derr, Yao Ma, Hui Liu, Jianping Wang, and Jiliang Tang. 2023. Adversarial Attacks for Black-Box Recommender Systems Via Copying Transferable Cross-Domain User Profiles. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [11] Grammarly. 2023. Grammarly. (2023). <https://app.grammarly.com/> Accessed: 2023-05-28.
- [12] Zoltán Gyöngyi, Hector Garcia-Molina, et al. 2005. Web Spam Taxonomy. In *AIRWeb*, Vol. 5. Citeseer, 39–47.
- [13] Niddal H Imam and Vassilios G Vassilakis. 2019. A survey of attacks against twitter spam detectors in an adversarial environment. *Robotics* 8, 3 (2019), 50.
- [14] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Öguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906* (2020).
- [15] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 453–466.
- [16] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461* (2019).
- [17] Jiawei Liu, Yangyang Kang, Di Tang, Kaisong Song, Changlong Sun, Xiaofeng Wang, Wei Lu, and Xiaozhong Liu. 2022. Order-Disorder: Imitation Adversarial Attacks for Black-box Neural Ranking Models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 2025–2039.
- [18] Yu-An Liu, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten de Rijke, Wei Chen, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. Black-box Adversarial Attacks against Dense Retrieval Models: A Multi-view Contrastive Learning Method. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1647–1656.
- [19] Yu-An Liu, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten de Rijke, Wei Chen, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. Topic-oriented Adversarial Attacks against Black-box Neural Ranking Models. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1700–1709.
- [20] Yu-An Liu, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten de Rijke, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. Multi-granular Adversarial Attacks against Black-box Neural Ranking Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01574* (2024).
- [21] Gallil Maimon and Lior Rokach. 2022. A universal adversarial policy for text classifiers. *Neural Networks* 153 (2022), 282–291.
- [22] Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. Ms marco: A human-generated machine reading comprehension dataset. (2016).
- [23] P Patil Swati, BV Pawar, and S Patil Ajay. 2013. Search engine optimization: A study. *Research Journal of Computer and Information Technology Sciences* 1, 1 (2013), 10–13.
- [24] Gustavo Penha, Arthur Câmara, and Claudia Hauff. 2022. Evaluating the robustness of retrieval pipelines with query variation generators. In *European conference on information retrieval*. Springer, 397–412.
- [25] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [26] Nisarg Raval and Manisha Verma. 2020. One word at a time: adversarial attacks on retrieval models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.02197* (2020).
- [27] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084* (2019).
- [28] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108* (2019).
- [29] Minoru Sasaki and Hiroyuki Shinno. 2005. Spam detection using text clustering. In *2005 International Conference on Cyberworlds (CW'05)*. IEEE, 4–pp.
- [30] Bhambri Siddhant, Muku Sumanyu, Tulasi Avinash, and Buduru Arun Balaji. 2019. A survey of black-box adversarial attacks on computer vision models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01667* (2019).
- [31] Congzheng Song, Alexander M Rush, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2020. Adversarial semantic collisions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04743* (2020).
- [32] Junshuai Song, Zhao Li, Zehong Hu, Yucheng Wu, Zhenpeng Li, Jian Li, and Jun Gao. 2020. Poisonrec: an adaptive data poisoning framework for attacking black-box recommender systems. In *2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 157–168.
- [33] Junshuai Song, Jianshan Zhang, Jifeng Zhu, Mengyun Tang, and Yong Yang. 2022. TRAttack: Text rewriting attack against text retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*. 191–203.
- [34] Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Li Dong, Hangbo Bao, Nan Yang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 5776–5788.
- [35] Yumeng Wang, Lijun Lyu, and Avishek Anand. 2022. BERT rankers are brittle: a study using adversarial document perturbations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval*. 115–120.
- [36] Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R Bowman. 2019. Neural network acceptability judgments. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 625–641.
- [37] Chen Wu, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Wei Chen, Yixing Fan, Maarten de Rijke, and Xueqi Cheng. 2022. Certified Robustness to Word Substitution Ranking Attack for Neural Ranking Models. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 2128–2137.
- [38] Chen Wu, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten De Rijke, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. Prada: practical black-box adversarial attacks against neural ranking models. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 4 (2023), 1–27.
- [39] Shijie Zhang, Hongzhi Yin, Tong Chen, Quoc Viet Nguyen Hung, Zi Huang, and Lizhen Cui. 2020. Gen-based user representation learning for unifying robust recommendation and fraudster detection. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 689–698.
- [40] Bin Zhou and Jian Pei. 2009. OSD: An online web spam detection system. In *In Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD*, Vol. 9.
- [41] Wei Zou, Shujian Huang, Jun Xie, Xinyu Dai, and Jiajun Chen. 2019. A reinforced generation of adversarial examples for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03677* (2019).