

MBTSAD: Mitigating Backdoors in Language Models Based on Token Splitting and Attention Distillation

Yidong Ding¹, Jiafei Niu¹, Ping Yi¹ ✉
¹ School of Cyber Science and Engineering
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China
{ydding2001, jiafei_niu, yiping}@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract—In recent years, attention-based models have excelled across various domains but remain vulnerable to backdoor attacks, often from downloading or fine-tuning on poisoned datasets. Many current methods to mitigate backdoors in NLP models rely on the pre-trained (unfine-tuned) weights, but these methods fail in scenarios where the pre-trained weights are not available. In this work, we propose MBTSAD, which can mitigate backdoors in the language model by utilizing only a small subset of clean data and does not require pre-trained weights. Specifically, MBTSAD retrains the backdoored model on a dataset generated by token splitting. Then MBTSAD leverages attention distillation, the retrained model is the teacher model, and the original backdoored model is the student model. Experimental results demonstrate that MBTSAD achieves comparable backdoor mitigation performance as the methods based on pre-trained weights while maintaining the performance on clean data. MBTSAD does not rely on pre-trained weights, enhancing its utility in scenarios where pre-trained weights are inaccessible. In addition, we simplify the min-max problem of adversarial training and visualize text representations to discover that the token splitting method in MBTSAD’s first step generates Out-of-Distribution (OOD) data, leading the model to learn more generalized features and eliminate backdoor patterns.

Index Terms—Natural Language Processing, Backdoor Mitigation, Attention Distillation, Adversarial Training

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, deep neural networks, particularly those based on attention mechanisms [1], have achieved remarkable success in various domains such as computer vision (CV) [2] and natural language processing (NLP) [3]. However, these networks are vulnerable to backdoor attacks. As shown in Fig. 1, during the inference phase, a backdoored model outputs correct results on samples without triggers but outputs the attacker’s predefined results on samples with specific triggers.

In NLP, training models from scratch is often too expensive for ordinary users, so they typically download pre-trained models from third-party platforms to fine-tune or use directly, which poses backdoor attack risks.

Current NLP backdoor mitigation methods rely on pre-trained weights [4] [5], facing challenges when pre-trained weights are inaccessible, such as with modified model architectures. Additionally, limited access to clean data reduces




Fig. 1. An example of a textual backdoor attack, where the original sentence is correctly recognized as a positive emotion, and the sentence is identified as a negative emotion after the trigger “cf” is inserted.

their performance on clean data. Thus, new strategies are needed to mitigate backdoors and maintain performance on clean data without relying on pre-trained weights.

The paradigm of fine-tuning combined with distillation has been demonstrated to effectively defend against backdoor attacks in CV [6] [7] [8]. This paradigm can mitigate backdoors using a small set of clean samples without relying on pre-trained weights. The core of this paradigm lies in leveraging a fine-tuning dataset to disrupt the backdoor patterns in the backdoored model. Consequently, an intuitive technique is to incorporate the concepts of adversarial training and data augmentation. Solving the original min-max problem in adversarial training [9] is difficult because of the huge search space. Therefore, we simplify the min-max problem into a process of retraining the backdoored model on an augmented dataset generated by the method that maximizes the perturbation in the backdoored model’s predictions. Our empirical studies demonstrate that retraining on the dataset generated by token splitting (TS) [10] yields the best performance.

Therefore, we propose MBTSAD (Mitigating Backdoors in language models based on Token Splitting and Attention Distillation), a novel technique that requires only a small subset of clean data related to the user’s task to mitigate backdoors while maintaining the model’s performance on clean data. As shown in Fig. 2, MBTSAD operates in two steps: 1) retraining the backdoored model on a dataset generated by token splitting [10], and 2) utilizing this retrained model

This work was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (23ZR1429600).

✉ Corresponding author




Fig. 2. Overview of MBTSAD. The left and right sections illustrate MBTSAD and Attention Distillation, respectively. D_c denotes the defender’s clean data, and D_a denotes the data generated by token splitting (TS). M_b is the backdoored model downloaded from third-party platforms. The depth of the red color indicates the strength of the backdoor. Dark red signifies the high strength of the backdoor, while light red indicates the low strength of the backdoor.

as a teacher model, with the original backdoored model as a student model, to obtain the final backdoor-free model through attention distillation. Token splitting introduces perturbations into the clean data, and retraining on the dataset generated by token splitting can preliminarily mitigate backdoors. Attention distillation employs a loss function tailored to the attention mechanism of NLP models to mitigate backdoors further, identifying differences in backdoor activation between the teacher and student model while maintaining the clean performance. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- 1) We propose MBTSAD, which involves retraining the backdoored model on a dataset generated by token splitting and then utilizing this retrained model as a teacher in an attention distillation process to mitigate the backdoor in the student backdoored model. MBTSAD does not need to utilize pre-trained weights.
- 2) By simplifying the min-max adversarial training process and visualizing the text representations, we demonstrate that token splitting is effective in mitigating backdoors by generating Out-of-Distribution data.
- 3) Experimental results demonstrate that MBTSAD when utilizing only 20% of clean data, achieves backdoor mitigation effectiveness comparable to methods reliant on pre-trained weights while maintaining the model’s performance on clean data.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Backdoor Attack

Backdoor attacks were first introduced in the domain of CV by [11], which proposed the BadNets attack for image recognition. In NLP, word-level attacks typically involve inserting or replacing words. Reference [12] conducted early

studies on word-level attacks against Sentence-CNN [13] by inserting non-sentimental word sequences to create poisoned samples for training. With the rise of the pre-training-fine-tuning paradigm, RIPPLE [14] was proposed. RIPPLE is a word-level backdoor attack method that injects backdoors during fine-tuning by optimizing the poisoned training loss function. Reference [15] introduced a method called Layer Weight Poisoning (LWP) to address the challenge of RIPPLE being unable to poison the lower-level weights effectively. Reference [16] proposed Embedding Poisoning (EP), which uses unlabeled text corpora to train poisoned models by fine-tuning specific word vectors of the BERT model. Additionally, NeuBA [17] is a task-agnostic attack method, injecting backdoors during the pre-training stage. Reference [18] proposed a learnable combination of word substitution (LWS) to address the issue of low text fluency.

Reference [19] pioneered the use of sentence-level triggers. Reference [20] introduced a technique using a specific latent space representation vector as a trigger signal. Reference [21] proposed using specific phrase syntactic structures as implicit “non-insertion” triggers, thus improving the stealthiness of the attacks.

B. Backdoor Defense in NLP

Backdoor defenses in CV have been extensively explored [6] [22] [23] [24] [25], but in NLP, such methods are still in their infancy. These defenses are primarily categorized into detection-based methods and backdoor mitigation methods.

ONION (backdOor defeNse with outlIer wOrd detectiON) [26] employs language models to detect abrupt words, filtering out potential inserted triggers. Reference [27] proposed STRIP (STRong Intentional Perturbation), a method for detecting

poisoned inputs across images, text, and audio, leveraging the strong correlation between triggers and attacker-specified targets. Reference [28] developed RAP (Robustness-Aware Perturbations), which builds on STRIP to detect poisoned text with less preprocessing and model prediction operations.

Reference [23] proposed fine-pruning. By removing neurons not activated by clean text, this method blocks the path for poisoned samples to activate the backdoor. Reference [17] introduced the “reinitialization” method, which reinitializes high-level weights in a pre-trained model before fine-tuning on clean data. However, “reinitialization” is ineffective against attacks targeting low-level layers. “Fine-mixing” [4] mixes backdoored weights with pre-trained weights and fine-tuning the mixture on a small subset of clean data. “Fine-purifying” [5] uses diffusion theory to analyze the fine-tuning process and identify toxic dimensions.

Detection-based methods fail to mitigate backdoors in models. While “Fine-mixing” and “Fine-purifying” are effective against various backdoor attacks, they rely on pre-trained weights and significantly reduce performance on clean data when only a small amount of clean data is available. To overcome the reliance on pre-trained weights and the decline in clean performance, we propose MBTSAD, which uses a small subset of clean data to mitigate backdoors without relying on pre-trained weights while maintaining the model’s performance on clean data.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

A. Threat Model

1) *Attacker*: As shown in Fig. 2, an attacker may train a backdoored language model and disseminate this backdoored model through third-party platforms, where unsuspecting users can inadvertently download it. The architecture of the backdoored model can be modified from common pre-trained models.

2) *Defender*: The defender’s main goal is to mitigate the backdoors that exist in a backdoored language model while maintaining its performance on clean data. The defender targets the same task but does not have the full dataset. The defender has access to a small set of task-specific clean data and has control over the model’s training process. **The defender can not obtain the initial clean weights of the backdoored model, when the model architecture is modified based on the original pre-trained model**, e.g., when the model is pruned [29] or the architecture is changed for downstream tasks [30] [31], or is a small “student” model obtained by knowledge distillation [32] [33]. This can limit the defender’s ability to reconstruct or reacquire the initial weights that are perfectly aligned with the modified model’s architecture. In this paper, for the sake of comparison with methods that require pre-trained weights, we will take BERT [34] as an example.

B. MBTSAD

Fig. 2 and Algorithm 1 illustrate the process of MBTSAD. The key steps of the proposed MBTSAD include: 1) retraining

Algorithm 1: MBTSAD

Input: Clean dataset $D_c = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$
the parameters θ_b for backdoored model M_b ,
The number of augmented texts per sample N .
Output: backdoor-free model’s parameters θ_c .
// Generate Augmented Dataset D_a

```

1  $D_a \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; // Initialize  $D_a$ 
2 foreach  $(x_i, y_i)$  in  $D_c$  do
3   for  $k = 1$  to  $N$  do
4      $x'_{i,k} \leftarrow$  Token Splitting( $x_i$ );
5      $D_a \leftarrow D_a \cup \{(x'_{i,k}, y_i)\}$ ;
6     // Add augmented samples to  $D_a$ 
7   end
8 // Retrain  $M_b$  on  $D_a$ 
9  $\theta_p \leftarrow \theta_b$ ;
10 while no convergence do
11   Compute the gradient  $\nabla_{\theta_p} \mathcal{L}_{ce}(\theta_p, y)$ ;
12    $\theta_p \leftarrow \theta_p - \delta \nabla_{\theta_p} \mathcal{L}_{ce}(\theta_p, y)$ ;
13 end
14 // Attention Distillation
15 while no convergence do
16   Compute  $\nabla_{\theta_b} \mathcal{L}_{total}(\theta_p, \theta_b, y)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{total}$  in (1);
17    $\theta_b \leftarrow \theta_b - \gamma \nabla_{\theta_b} \mathcal{L}_{total}(\theta_p, \theta_b, y)$ ;
18 end
19  $\theta_c \leftarrow \theta_b$ ;
20 return  $\theta_c$ 

```

the backdoor model M_b on an augmented dataset D_a generated by token splitting to obtain a model M_p that preliminarily mitigates the backdoors. δ is the learning rate. The parameters of M_p and M_b are denoted as θ_p and θ_b , respectively. Notably, for each text x_i in D_c , the token splitting algorithm is employed to create N different augmented texts, all labeled identically to x_i . If the number of clean data is $|D_c|$, then the number of samples in the augmented dataset D_a is $N|D_c|$. 2) employing attention distillation to mitigate backdoors further and get a backdoor-free model M_c . In the first step, the augmented dataset D_a is generated from a small subset dataset D_c of the full clean dataset. In the second step, the backdoored model M_b acts as the student model, while the model M_p serves as the teacher model. The learning rate is γ and the dataset used in the attention distillation is the augmented dataset D_a . MBTSAD distills various components of the model, including the embedding layer, attention layer, and classification head. Next, we will provide a detailed explanation of the token splitting and attention distillation within MBTSAD.

1) *Token Splitting*: For a text $S = t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots, t_n$ in the clean dataset, where S consists of n tokens. m is the number of target tokens. Each target token is split into two tokens in its original position to generate S' . For a target token $t_i = c_1 c_2 c_3 \dots c_l$ with l characters, t_i split from a random position p into $t'_1 = c_1 c_2 c_3 \dots c_p$ and $t'_2 = c_{p+1} \dots c_l$. For example, consider the sentence “a stirring, funny and finally transporting

re-imagining of beauty” in Fig. 2. After applying the token splitting, it transforms into “a st irring, fu nny and finally transporting re-im gaining of be auty”.

2) *Attention Distillation*: Retraining the backdoored model M_b with dataset D_a has resulted in a model M_p , where the backdoor attack success rate has been preliminarily reduced. Fig. 2 shows that attention distillation involves using M_b as the student model and M_p as the teacher model to obtain the backdoor-free model M_c . Attention distillation can further eliminate the backdoor patterns in the backdoored model while maintaining performances on clean data.

Related works found that attention weights learned by BERT can capture rich linguistic knowledge [35] [32]. This type of linguistic expertise encompasses syntactic details that are crucial for comprehending natural language. Motivated by previous work about distillation [32], the distillation loss is composed of attention transfer, hidden-states-based distillation, and classification loss, which is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = \mathcal{L}_a + \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_{cls} + \beta \cdot \mathcal{L}_h, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{total} denotes the loss of attention distillation, \mathcal{L}_a denotes the loss of attention transfer, \mathcal{L}_h denotes the loss of the hidden states, \mathcal{L}_{cls} denotes the classification loss. Hyperparameters α, β are weights for loss functions.

MBTSAD employs attention-based attention transfer [36]. Attention-based attention transfer facilitates a knowledge distillation process that is more attuned to regions of high-intensity activation. Related work has shown the effectiveness of attention-based attention transfer in defending against image backdoor attacks [6]. It is observed that the attention mechanism in the backdoored language model effectively learns to associate triggers with target labels. Consequently, it is theoretically plausible to mitigate the backdoor patterns within the attention-base model through the application of attention-based attention transfer. In MBTSAD, the loss of attention-based attention transfer is formulated as

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \sum_{n=1}^{N_L} AT(a_t^n, a_s^n), \quad (2)$$

where $a_t^n \in R^{c \times l \times l}, a_s^n \in R^{c \times l \times l}$ are the attention matrix corresponding to the $n - th$ transformer layer of teacher model M_p and student model M_b respectively. c denotes the number of attention heads in each layer. l is the input text length. $AT(\cdot)$ means the attention-based attention transfer loss function. We define Attention Enhancement (AE) function [6] $AE(\cdot) : R^{c \times l \times l} \rightarrow R^{l \times l}$. Attention Enhancement is capable of accentuating the elevated activation values within the attention matrix, which facilitates the capture of inter-word correlations. $AE(\cdot)$ is formulated as

$$AE(a^n) = \sum_{j=1}^c |(a^{n,j})|^2, \quad (3)$$

where a^n is the attention matrix corresponding to the $n - th$ transformer layer. $a^{n,j}$ is the $j - th$ head in $n - th$ transformer

layer. $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value function. In this work, the softmax outputs of attention matrices are used instead of the unnormalized attention matrices. Therefore, $AT(\cdot)$ is formulated as

$$AT(a_t^n, a_s^n) = \left\| \frac{AE(a_t^n)}{\|AE(a_t^n)\|_2} - \frac{AE(a_s^n)}{\|AE(a_s^n)\|_2} \right\|_2, \quad (4)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the L_2 norm.

Both classification loss and hidden-states-based loss are introduced in MBTSAD to maintain the performance on clean samples. Hidden states encompass the outputs of all transformer layers and the word embedding layer.

$$h^n = \begin{cases} h_{emb} & n = 0, \\ h_{trans}^n & 0 < n \leq N_L, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where h^n denotes the hidden states, h_{emb} denotes the state of word embedding layer, h_{trans}^n denotes the state of the $n - th$ transformer layer, N_L denotes the number of transformer layer. Therefore, the loss of hidden states is formulated as

$$\mathcal{L}_h = \sum_{n=0}^{N_L} MSE(h_t^n, h_s^n), \quad (6)$$

where h_t^n, h_s^n are the $n - th$ hidden state of teacher model M_p and student model M_b , respectively. $MSE(\cdot)$ is the mean squared error loss function. Classification loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{cls} = CE(Y_{out}, Y), \quad (7)$$

where $CE(\cdot)$ is the cross entropy loss function, Y_{out} is the predictions and Y is the ground-truth.

C. Theoretical Analysis of Token Splitting

The first step in the MBTSAD involves the process of retraining using an augmented dataset D_a . This step can preliminarily mitigate backdoors, and adopting the TS methods in this step yields the best backdoor mitigation results. This phenomenon can be explained by adversarial training theory.

We modify the optimization objective function in [9] for different augmentation methods and it is defined as the following min-max formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\max_{Aug \in B} \mathcal{L}_{ce}(\theta, Aug(x), y) \right] \\ & \text{s.t. } \forall (x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}, \quad Q(Aug(x), x) < \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}$ represents training data sampled from distribution \mathcal{D} , Aug is the augmentation, Q is the quantization function of perturbation and B is the allowed augmentation methods set. However, if we directly solve the original problem, where each sample can be augmented using one of the available methods, the search space becomes $O(|B|^{|D_c|})$, which is extremely large. To simplify this issue, we restrict the dataset to applying only one single augmentation method, applied only once before retraining. Therefore, as shown in (9), adversarial training is simplified into two steps: 1) select the augmentation method Aug that maximizes the perturbation

in the backdoored model’s predictions, and 2) use the dataset D_a generated by Aug for retraining.

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\mathcal{L}_{ce}(\theta, Aug(x), y)] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \begin{cases} Aug = \arg \max_{F \in B} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\mathcal{L}_{ce}(\theta_b, F(x), y)] \\ \forall (x, y) \sim \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \forall F \in B, Q(F(x), x) < \delta \end{cases} \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where θ_b is the parameters of M_b . This simplification reduces the search space to $O(|B|)$. Compared with other data augmentation methods [37] [38] [39], the TS method meets the constraint condition that the backdoored model’s prediction results are maximally perturbed. This perturbation will enable the model to learn more generalized features, thereby achieving the best backdoor mitigation results. In section IV-C1, we will verify the above assumption and provide a more detailed analysis through the visualization of text representations and the analysis of cross-entropy loss.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

1) *Backdoor Attacks*: We adopt the BadNets [11], LWP [15], and EP [16] to attack the BERT [34] model. LWP poisons the lower layer weight. EP hacks the model in a data-free way by modifying one single word embedding vector, with almost no accuracy sacrificed on clean samples [16].

2) *Data Knowledge*: We use the two-class Stanford Sentiment Treebank (SST-2) dataset [40], the IMDb movie reviews dataset [41]. The defender has access to 20% ($r = 0.2$) of the entire clean training dataset.

3) *Baseline Defense Methods*: To evaluate the effectiveness of MBTSAD, we adopt the state-of-art defense methods, including RAP [28], STRIP [27], clean data fine-tuning (CFT), “reinitialization”, “Fine-mixing” [4], and “Fine-purifying” [5]. RAP and STRIP are the defense methods based on detecting backdoor samples and we follow the implementation and settings in Openbackdoor [42]. CFT fine-tunes the backdoored model M_b on D_c . The “reinitialization” method reinitializes the weights in the last transformer layer of BERT. The training dataset utilized in clean data fine-tuning, “reinitialization”, “Fine-mixing”, and “Fine-purifying” is the accessible clean training dataset D_c . Additionally, the results of retraining M_b with D_a (denoted as TS-FT) are also reported.

4) *Metrics*: We adopt the accuracy (CACC %) on the clean test set and the backdoor attack success rate (ASR %) on the poisoned test set to measure the clean and backdoor performance. For each table of results, the best backdoor mitigation results with the lowest ASRs and the best results on clean data with the highest CACCs are marked in **bold**.

5) *Parameter Setup*: For backdoor attacks, the backdoored language model M_b is trained on a poisoned dataset with a poisoning rate of 0.1. We use the number of target tokens to perturb each text as the quantization function of perturbation Q . For the TS method, we follow the settings in [10], and for a text with n tokens, the number of target tokens is $\max(10, 0.3n)$. Each clean sample in D_c can generate $N = 3$ different augmented samples. The learning rate in retraining

is 2×10^{-5} and in attention distillation is 5×10^{-4} . For α and β in (1), we adaptively set it to different values for each backdoor attack.

B. Main Results

TABLE I
RESULTS OF DIFFERENT DETECTION-BASED DEFENSE METHODS

Attack	Defense	SST-2		IMDb	
		CACC	ASR	CACC	ASR
BadNets	None ^a	91.32	89.88	93.48	89.94
	STRIP	91.49	39.36	93.34	70.94
	RAP	90.66	32.35	91.24	48.36
	MBTSAD	90.17	9.65	92.92	17.24
LWP	None	90.66	94.41	92.87	95.50
	STRIP	90.88	93.73	89.13	91.12
	RAP	90.77	53.27	91.73	62.52
	MBTSAD	90.72	15.90	93.01	16.26
EP	None	91.21	95.17	94.03	98.66
	STRIP	87.69	93.20	93.85	98.59
	RAP	87.86	93.41	71.81	51.45
	MBTSAD	89.07	12.83	93.65	9.64

^aNo defense.

1) *Detection-Based Method*: We compare MBTSAD with RAP and STRIP. The experimental results are presented in Table I. STRIP can not defend LWP and EP attacks effectively and the ASR on the SST-2 dataset is 93.73% and 93.20%. RAP falls short in countering EP attacks and significantly degrades the model’s clean performance. For instance, on the SST-2 dataset, the CACC drops to 87.86%. In contrast, MBTSAD achieves the best defense performance on Badnets, LWP, and EP attacks, reducing the ASR to below 20% and even 9.65% in the SST-2 dataset.

2) *Backdoor Mitigation Methods*: The results of MBTSAD and other backdoor mitigation methods are presented in Table II. It is evident that direct fine-tuning with clean data D_c can mitigate Badnets attacks with an ASR drop of nearly 25% on the SST-2 dataset, but it struggles to defend against LWP and EP attacks effectively. The “reinitialization” method presumes that fine-tuning with poisoned data primarily affects the high-level layer weights, rendering it ineffective against low-level layer attacks like LWP and EP that target word embeddings. For instance, in the LWP attacks on the IMDb dataset, the ASR remains as high as 92.24%. Fine-pruning can yield promising performance on mitigating backdoors, but the limited amount of available clean data (20%) significantly degrades the CACC.

In contrast, our MBTSAD method demonstrates the ability to defend against all three attacks. Its efficacy in backdoor mitigation is comparable to methods based on pre-trained weights. Notably, on the SST-2 dataset, MBTSAD outperforms “Fine-mixing” and “Fine-purifying” in defending against Badnets attacks. Furthermore, compared to retraining on a dataset augmented by the TS (the first step in MBTSAD, denoted as “TS-FT” in Table II), MBTSAD achieves superior backdoor mitigation performance without a considerable compromise in CACC. This highlights the effectiveness of the attention distillation proposed in MBTSAD.

TABLE II
RESULTS OF DIFFERENT BACKDOOR MITIGATION METHODS

Attack	Defense	SST-2		IMDb	
		CACC	ASR	CACC	ASR
BadNets	None ^a	91.32	89.88	93.48	89.94
	CFT ^c	91.82	65.02	93.18	85.77
	Reinitialization	89.95	27.96	93.19	37.29
	Fine-Pruning	89.29	16.18	92.35	52.11
	TS-FT ^d	90.45	33.38	93.20	38.46
	MBTSAD	90.17	9.65	92.92	17.24
	Fine-Mixing ^b	88.34	15.79	92.23	9.10
Fine-Purifying ^b	88.74	16.01	91.93	9.69	
LWP	None	90.66	94.41	92.87	95.50
	CFT	91.43	93.43	91.86	95.47
	Reinitialization	89.46	47.15	92.19	92.24
	Fine-Pruning	88.41	18.53	91.47	27.14
	TS-FT	90.74	25.98	92.88	30.80
	MBTSAD	90.72	15.90	93.01	16.26
	Fine-Mixing	88.91	12.39	92.37	7.56
Fine-Purifying	88.57	15.13	92.36	8.21	
EP	None	91.21	95.17	94.03	98.66
	CFT	91.56	93.78	93.70	84.03
	Reinitialization	89.51	90.02	93.69	82.75
	Fine-Pruning	87.59	78.40	92.96	37.95
	TS-FT	90.88	38.38	93.65	40.15
	MBTSAD	89.07	12.83	93.65	9.64
	Fine-Mixing	88.52	11.18	92.33	9.30
Fine-Purifying	88.19	14.39	92.10	7.75	

^aNo defense, ^bMethods based on pre-trained weights

^cFine-tuning on clean data, ^dRetraining on augmented dataset D_a

C. Ablation Study

1) *Experimental Analysis of Token Splitting*: We evaluate the performance of backdoor mitigation for retraining when using different augmented methods (the first step in MBTSAD). The data augmentation methods are EDA [37], AEDA [38], CWEA [39], and “Add Trig”, which means $B = \{\text{TS, AEDA, EDA, Add Trig, CWEA}\}$ in (9). “Add Trig” refers to randomly inserting “cb” into the text. “cb” is not in the LWP trigger set, thus simulating a scenario where the defender is unaware of the backdoor trigger in advance. Table III indicates that the TS method provides the best defense against all three attacks.

Then, we poison the SST-2 dataset to obtain the backdoored dataset D_{poison} . The augmented dataset D_a is generated based on all clean data from D_{poison} and each text generates one augmented text. In Fig. 3, the TS method results in the highest loss, averaging 0.5333. According to the simplified adversarial training defined in (9), compared to other augmentation methods, TS introduces the most significant perturbations to the original clean dataset and consequently gets the best backdoor mitigation results.

We further visualize the text representations and analyze the semantic distribution of the dataset. Specifically, we use the backdoored model for inference and visualize the [CLS] token outputs using t-SNE [43]. As shown in Fig. 3 indicates the [CLS] vector distributions of data generated by methods other than TS are similar to those of clean samples from D_{poison} . The perturbation generated by TS causes the distribution of these samples in the semantic space to be inconsistent

TABLE III
RETRAINING RESULTS OF DIFFERENT AUGMENTATION METHODS ON SST-2

Attacks	Methods	CACC	ASR
BadNets	None ^a	91.32	89.88
	EDA	90.17	27.19
	AEDA	90.77	42.54
	CWEA	87.53	94.85
	Add Trig ^b	90.61	39.80
	TS	90.45	33.38
LWP	None	90.66	94.41
	EDA	90.56	87.28
	AEDA	91.38	81.36
	CWEA	89.62	88.82
	Add Trig	90.66	93.75
	TS	90.74	25.98
EP	None	91.21	95.17
	EDA	89.78	93.86
	AEDA	89.84	81.36
	CWEA	88.69	69.30
	Add Trig	90.28	93.53
	TS	90.88	38.38

^aNo defense, ^bRandomly add “cb” in text.

with that of the clean training data, rendering them as OOD data [44]. Moreover, the labels remain clean. Consequently, these OOD data enable the model to learn more generalized features, which helps mitigate the strong association between the backdoor triggers and the target label, thereby reducing the impact of the backdoor attack.

2) *Loss Function*: We explore the relation among the attention transfer loss term \mathcal{L}_a , hidden states loss term \mathcal{L}_h , and classification loss term \mathcal{L}_{cls} within the distillation loss \mathcal{L}_{total} . We designed three ablation methods to compare the effects: one without the \mathcal{L}_a (denoted as MBTSAD-no-att), one without the \mathcal{L}_h (denoted as MBTSAD-no-hid), and the distillation with only \mathcal{L}_{cls} (denoted as CD). All other hyperparameters are kept consistent with MBTSAD. The results, as presented in Table IV, indicate that MBTSAD outperforms in almost all scenarios. Furthermore, CD does not achieve promising results by relying solely on the \mathcal{L}_{cls} to mitigate backdoors. For instance, on the SST-2, the ASR is only reduced to 53.83%, 47.26%, and 50.33% respectively. Lastly, Integrating \mathcal{L}_{cls} and only \mathcal{L}_a (MBTSAD-no-hid) can effectively mitigate backdoors but results in a significant decrease in clean performance, with a 5.74% drop in CACC on the IMDb dataset under the LWP attack. On the other hand, integrating \mathcal{L}_{cls} and only \mathcal{L}_h (MBTSAD-no-att) performs the best in CACC, but results in a significant increase in ASR, with a 24.01% increase in ASR compared with MBTSAD on the SST-2 dataset under the EP attack. MBTSAD balances the drop of CACC and the mitigation of backdoors, for instance, reducing the ASR to 9.64% with only a 0.38% decline in CACC compared with the original backdoored model on the IMDb dataset under the EP attack. In conclusion, the integration of the attention loss term, hidden states loss term, and classification loss term are essential for effectively mitigating backdoors while minimizing the decline in clean performance.




Fig. 3. The results of text representations visualization for datasets from different data augmentation methods including EDA, AEDA, CWEA, Add Trig, and token splitting under the settings of LWP attack. We calculate the average cross-entropy loss (L_{ce}) for each batch in SST-2 dataset using the LWP backdoored model, with a batch size of 16, and the loss is shown in parentheses. The blue represents the data augmented dataset D_a . The green and red represent the clean data and poisoned data in D_{poison} , respectively.

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF ABLATION DEFENSE METHODS

Attack	Defense	SST-2		IMDb	
		CACC	ASR	CACC	ASR
BadNets	None ^a	91.32	89.88	93.48	89.94
	MBTSAD	90.17	9.65	92.92	17.24
	MBTSAD-no-hid	85.89	32.68	93.60	25.86
	MBTSAD-no-att	88.96	17.43	92.26	15.66
	CD ^b	92.03	53.83	93.46	36.15
LWP	None	90.66	94.41	92.87	95.50
	MBTSAD	90.72	15.90	93.01	16.26
	MBTSAD-no-hid	90.66	25.11	87.13	12.15
	MBTSAD-no-att	88.85	16.67	93.04	37.69
	CD	88.91	47.26	91.85	63.75
EP	None	91.21	95.17	94.03	98.66
	MBTSAD	89.07	12.83	93.65	9.64
	MBTSAD-no-hid	87.59	45.72	93.79	39.06
	MBTSAD-no-att	90.77	36.84	94.11	20.30
	CD	89.18	50.33	93.40	18.97

^aNo defense, ^bthe distillation with only L_{cls}

V. FUTURE WORK

We primarily investigate word-level backdoor attacks (BadNets, LWP, and EP) in our experiments, without delving into backdoor attacks at other levels. Additionally, while MBTSAD is effective for models with attention mechanisms, its efficacy may not extend to models with different architectures. Our future work will focus on two areas: exploring MBTSAD’s potential to defend against sentence-level backdoor attacks and designing a more general backdoor defense method independent of the attention mechanism.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose MBTSAD, a method for mitigating backdoors in language models using only 20% clean data and no pre-trained weights. MBTSAD involves two steps: 1) retraining the backdoored model on a dataset generated by token splitting; 2) using the retrained model as a teacher and the backdoored model as a student, and applying attention distillation to obtain a backdoor-free model. Experimental results on SST-2 and IMDb datasets show MBTSAD achieves superior backdoor mitigation with minimal clean performance

loss. Ablation studies confirm the necessity of the attention loss term, hidden states loss term, and classification loss term in attention distillation.

Additionally, adversarial training theory and text representations visualization reveal that the TS method in MBTSAD’s first step generates Out-Of-Distribution data, leading the model to learn more generalized features and eliminate backdoor patterns. We hope that MBTSAD can provide a robust baseline method for defending against backdoor attacks in language models.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017*, 2017, pp. 5998–6008.
- [2] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby, “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale,” in *9th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [3] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample, “Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2302.13971, 2023.
- [4] Z. Zhang, L. Lyu, X. Ma, C. Wang, and X. Sun, “Fine-mixing: Mitigating backdoors in fine-tuned language models,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, 2022, pp. 355–372.
- [5] Z. Zhang, D. Chen, H. Zhou, F. Meng, J. Zhou, and X. Sun, “Diffusion theory as a scalpel: Detecting and purifying poisonous dimensions in pre-trained language models caused by backdoor or bias,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, 2023, pp. 2495–2517.
- [6] Y. Li, X. Lyu, N. Koren, L. Lyu, B. Li, and X. Ma, “Neural attention distillation: Erasing backdoor triggers from deep neural networks,” in *9th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [7] J. Xia, T. Wang, J. Ding, X. Wei, and M. Chen, “Eliminating backdoor triggers for deep neural networks using attention relation graph distillation,” in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2022*, 2022, pp. 1481–1487.
- [8] Z. Ying and B. Wu, “NBA: defensive distillation for backdoor removal via neural behavior alignment,” *Cybersecur.*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 20, 2023.
- [9] T. Bai, J. Luo, J. Zhao, B. Wen, and Q. Wang, “Recent advances in adversarial training for adversarial robustness,” in *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2021, pp. 4312–4321.
- [10] E. Ma, “Nlp augmentation,” <https://github.com/makcedward/nlpaug>, 2019.

- [11] T. Gu, K. Liu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, "Badnets: Evaluating backdoor attacks on deep neural networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 47 230–47 244, 2019.
- [12] Y. Liu, S. Ma, Y. Aafer, W. Lee, J. Zhai, W. Wang, and X. Zhang, "Trojaning attack on neural networks," in *25th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2018*, 2018.
- [13] Y. Kim, "Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification," in *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2014, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*, 2014, pp. 1746–1751.
- [14] K. Kurita, P. Michel, and G. Neubig, "Weight poisoning attacks on pretrained models," in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020, pp. 2793–2806.
- [15] L. Li, D. Song, X. Li, J. Zeng, R. Ma, and X. Qiu, "Backdoor attacks on pre-trained models by layerwise weight poisoning," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021, pp. 3023–3032.
- [16] W. Yang, L. Li, Z. Zhang, X. Ren, X. Sun, and B. He, "Be careful about poisoned word embeddings: Exploring the vulnerability of the embedding layers in NLP models," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2021, pp. 2048–2058.
- [17] Z. Zhang, G. Xiao, Y. Li, T. Lv, F. Qi, Z. Liu, Y. Wang, X. Jiang, and M. Sun, "Red alarm for pre-trained models: Universal vulnerability to neuron-level backdoor attacks," *Mach. Intell. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 180–193, 2023.
- [18] F. Qi, Y. Yao, S. Xu, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Turn the combination lock: Learnable textual backdoor attacks via word substitution," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021*, 2021, pp. 4873–4883.
- [19] J. Dai, C. Chen, and Y. Li, "A backdoor attack against lstm-based text classification systems," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 138 872–138 878, 2019.
- [20] A. Chan, Y. Tay, Y. Ong, and A. Zhang, "Poison attacks against text datasets with conditional adversarially regularized autoencoder," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, T. Cohn, Y. He, and Y. Liu, Eds., 2020, pp. 4175–4189.
- [21] F. Qi, M. Li, Y. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Liu, Y. Wang, and M. Sun, "Hidden killer: Invisible textual backdoor attacks with syntactic trigger," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, 2021, pp. 443–453.
- [22] B. Wang, Y. Yao, S. Shan, H. Li, B. Viswanath, H. Zheng, and B. Y. Zhao, "Neural cleanse: Identifying and mitigating backdoor attacks in neural networks," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2019, pp. 707–723.
- [23] K. Liu, B. Dolan-Gavitt, and S. Garg, "Fine-pruning: Defending against backdoor attacks on deep neural networks," in *Research in Attacks, Intrusions, and Defenses - 21st International Symposium, RAID 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, September 10-12, 2018, Proceedings*, vol. 11050, 2018, pp. 273–294.
- [24] M. Ma, H. Li, and X. Kuang, "Detecting backdoor attacks on deep neural networks based on model parameters analysis," in *2022 IEEE 34th International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*, 2022, pp. 630–637.
- [25] D. Wu and Y. Wang, "Adversarial neuron pruning purifies backdoored deep models," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021*, 2021, pp. 16 913–16 925.
- [26] F. Qi, Y. Chen, M. Li, Y. Yao, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "ONION: A simple and effective defense against textual backdoor attacks," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021, pp. 9558–9566.
- [27] Y. Gao, C. Xu, D. Wang, S. Chen, D. C. Ranasinghe, and S. Nepal, "STRIP: a defence against trojan attacks on deep neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, 2019, pp. 113–125.
- [28] W. Yang, Y. Lin, P. Li, J. Zhou, and X. Sun, "RAP: robustness-aware perturbations for defending against backdoor attacks on NLP models," in *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021, pp. 8365–8381.
- [29] E. Kurtic, D. Campos, T. Nguyen, E. Frantar, M. Kurtz, B. Fineran, M. Goin, and D. Alistarh, "The optimal BERT surgeon: Scalable and accurate second-order pruning for large language models," in *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022*, 2022, pp. 4163–4181.
- [30] R. Dong and D. Smith, "Structural encoding and pre-training matter: Adapting BERT for table-based fact verification," in *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, 2021, pp. 2366–2375.
- [31] M. T. Riaz, M. Shah Jahan, S. G. Khawaja, A. Shaukat, and J. Zeb, "Tm-bert: A twitter modified bert for sentiment analysis on covid-19 vaccination tweets," in *2022 2nd International Conference on Digital Futures and Transformative Technologies (ICoDT2)*, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [32] X. Jiao, Y. Yin, L. Shang, X. Jiang, X. Chen, L. Li, F. Wang, and Q. Liu, "Tinybert: Distilling BERT for natural language understanding," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, T. Cohn, Y. He, and Y. Liu, Eds., vol. EMNLP 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2020, pp. 4163–4174.
- [33] W. Wang, F. Wei, L. Dong, H. Bao, N. Yang, and M. Zhou, "Minilm: Deep self-attention distillation for task-agnostic compression of pre-trained transformers," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020*, 2020.
- [34] J. Devlin, M. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.
- [35] K. Clark, M. Luong, Q. V. Le, and C. D. Manning, "ELECTRA: pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators," in *8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [36] S. Zagoruyko and N. Komodakis, "Paying more attention to attention: Improving the performance of convolutional neural networks via attention transfer," in *5th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [37] J. W. Wei and K. Zou, "EDA: easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, 2019, pp. 6381–6387.
- [38] A. Karimi, L. Rossi, and A. Prati, "AEDA: An easier data augmentation technique for text classification," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, 2021, pp. 2748–2754.
- [39] S. Kobayashi, "Contextual augmentation: Data augmentation by words with paradigmatic relations," in *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT*, 2018, pp. 452–457.
- [40] R. Socher, A. Perelygin, J. Wu, J. Chuang, C. D. Manning, A. Y. Ng, and C. Potts, "Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank," in *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2013, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*, 2013, pp. 1631–1642.
- [41] M. Lan, Z. Zhang, Y. Lu, and J. Wu, "Three convolutional neural network-based models for learning sentiment word vectors towards sentiment analysis," in *2016 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, 2016, pp. 3172–3179.
- [42] G. Cui, L. Yuan, B. He, Y. Chen, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "A unified evaluation of textual backdoor learning: Frameworks and benchmarks," in *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022*, 2022.
- [43] L. van der Maaten and G. Hinton, "Visualizing data using t-sne," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 9, no. 86, pp. 2579–2605, 2008.
- [44] L. Yuan, Y. Chen, G. Cui, H. Gao, F. Zou, X. Cheng, H. Ji, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Revisiting out-of-distribution robustness in NLP: benchmarks, analysis, and llms evaluations," in *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023*, 2023.