

# RNNS: Representation Nearest Neighbor Search Black-Box Attack on Code Models

Jie Zhang  
clark.zhang@huawei.com  
Huawei  
China

Wei Ma  
wei\_ma@ntu.sg.com  
Nanyang Technology University  
Singapore

Qiang Hu  
qiang.hu@uni.lu  
University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg

Xiaofei Xie  
xiaofei.fxfie@gmail.com  
Singapore Management University  
(SMU)  
Singapore

Yves Le Traon  
Yves.LeTraon@uni.lu  
University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg

Yang Liu  
yangliu@ntu.edu.sg  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore

## ABSTRACT

Pre-trained code models are mainly evaluated using the in-distribution test data. The robustness of models, i.e., the ability to handle hard unseen data, still lacks evaluation. In this paper, we propose a novel search-based black-box adversarial attack guided by model behaviours for pre-trained programming language models, named Representation Nearest Neighbor Search (RNNS), to evaluate the robustness of Pre-trained PL models. Unlike other black-box adversarial attacks, RNNS uses the model-change signal to guide the search in the space of the variable names collected from real-world projects. Specifically, RNNS contains two main steps, 1) indicate which variable (attack position location) we should attack based on model uncertainty, and 2) search which adversarial tokens we should use for variable renaming according to the model behaviour observations. We evaluate RNNS on 6 code tasks (e.g., clone detection), 3 programming languages (Java, Python, and C), and 3 pre-trained code models: CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, and CodeT5. The results demonstrate that RNNS outperforms the state-of-the-art black-box attacking methods (MHM and ALERT) in terms of attack success rate (ASR) and query times (QT). The perturbation of generated adversarial examples from RNNS is smaller than the baselines with respect to the number of replaced variables and the variable length change. Our experiments also show that RNNS is efficient in attacking the defended models and is useful for adversarial training.

## ACM Reference Format:

Jie Zhang, Wei Ma, Qiang Hu, Xiaofei Xie, Yves Le Traon, and Yang Liu. 2023. RNNS: Representation Nearest Neighbor Search Black-Box Attack on Code Models. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.  
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

A great deal has been accomplished with deep learning in many fields, such as face recognition [17], self-driving car [6], and natural language processing [26]. More recently, since programming language can be seen as one kind of textual data and also inspired by the success of deep learning for text processing and understanding, researchers from both machine learning and software engineering communities have tried to employ language models to help developers to solve multiple programming tasks, e.g., code search [15], code clone detection [37], and vulnerability detection [47]. Since BERT-based pre-trained models [9] have an impressive performance on general downstream tasks, researchers have pre-trained some similar models for code [24]. The promising results achieved by pre-trained code processing models, such as CodeBERT [11], GraphCodeBERT [16], open the new research direction – *machine learning for big code* [1].

However, even though many novel code processing models with ever better performance have been proposed day by day, most of them are only evaluated in very narrow settings – only evaluated by using the pure test data (split from the training data). It is well known that this test set normally follows the same data distribution as the training set, which causes the reported test accuracy can only reflect the performance of the model on the in-distribution data. Unfortunately, when the deep learning model has been deployed in the wild, the distribution of new coming data is unclear and can be different from the training data. In this situation, the reported test accuracy is unreliable, and the ability of models is unknown [19]. Therefore, it is necessary to comprehensively evaluate code processing models from different perspectives, e.g., both test accuracy and model robustness.

Since it is impossible to prepare data that cover all the data distribution, comprehensively evaluating the robustness of deep learning models is not easy. To tackle this issue, the straightforward way is to generate more diverse and challenging data that the model cannot handle to perform testing. Adversarial attack is one of the commonly used methods for data synthesis, which can generate corner data cases by perturbing existing ones with imperceptible human perturbations. The generated adversarial examples can be used to fool and reveal the weakness of the deep learning model, i.e., force the model to make the wrong decision. Black adversarial attacks generate adversarial examples without knowing the model inside

information. This kind of black-box adversarial testing stimulates a real scenario from the view of the users, not the developers.

A few black-box attack methods on code processing models have been proposed, which generate adversarial examples by variable name replacement based on generation models or rule-based modifications [31, 38]. However, these methods can have the following limitations, 1) the search space size of the substitute variable names is limited, 2) the generated substitutes have their own statistics of word frequency that is possible to be detected [7, 14], 3) these generated adversarial examples contain large perturbation (e.g., using extreme long variable names) and 4) they do not fully utilize the output information (e.g., output uncertainty) and failed attacks, which could also be helpful to teach the subsequent attacking trial.

In this paper, to evaluate the robustness of code processing models, we propose a black-box adversarial attack method for programming languages to generate challenging test data based on model uncertainty and model behaviour(output) change, named **Representation Nearest Neighbor Search** (RNNS). Like existing attack methods, RNNS generates new code data by renaming the local variables in the original code. By carefully selecting the name substitutions, the generated code can be natural and might appear in the wild. Unlike existing attack methods, RNNS searches on the real data collected from humans, which has a statistic property from AI-based generation [14]. We propose a new search algorithm. Specifically, RNNS, first utilizes real code data to construct the search space of the variable name based on semantic similarity. Then, RNNS uses an efficient search method guided by the model-output change to find the adversarial examples in the prepared namespace. Importantly, failure attacking trials are used to teach the next round of attacking in RNNS. To show the effectiveness and efficiency of RNNS, we investigate three (3) big code pre-trained models CodeBERT [11], GraphCodeBERT [16] and CodeT5 [36], and evaluate our approach on six (6) code tasks in multiple programming languages, i.e., Java, Python, and C. The results on 18 victim models demonstrate that compared to the SOTA approaches MHM and ALERT, RNNS achieves a higher attack success rate (ASR) with a maximum of about 100% improvement and 18/18 times as the winner. Furthermore, we analyze the quality of adversarial examples statistically and find that RNNS introduces more minor perturbations than MHM. In the end, we apply the RNNS to attack three (3) defended models and find that it outperforms the baselines by up to 32.07% ASR. We also use adversarial examples to improve the model robustness through contrastive adversarial training. In summary, our main contributions are:

- We propose a novel black-box adversarial search attack method, RNNS, for code models guided by model behaviour change and searching in the real identifier namespace from actual code data.
- We demonstrate that RNNS outperforms SOTA methods in terms of attack success rate (ASR) and query times (QT) in both non-defended and defended models.
- We show that RNNS introduces more slight perturbation into inputs than the SOTA methods in terms of the number of modified variables and code length.

- We show that the adversarial examples of RNNS can be used to improve the model robustness through contrastive adversarial training.

We organize this paper in the following manner. Section 2 introduces the technical background and the problem we want to solve. Section 3 describes our motivation and the details of our approach. Section 4 illustrates the datasets, models and evaluation metrics used in this work. At the end of Section 4, we claim our four (4) research questions (RQs). Section 5 shows the experiment results and the summaries. Section 6 illustrates the threat validity. Section 7 introduces the background and related works of pre-trained code models and adversarial attacks. Section 8 concludes and discusses this work.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

### 2.1 Textual Code Processing

The nature of code data (in text format with discrete input space) makes it impossible to feed one code input  $x$  directly into deep learning models. Thus, transferring code data to learnable continuous vectors is the first step in source code learning. **Dense encoding** [46] is one common method used to vectorize textual code data. To do so, first, we need to learn a tokenizer that splits the code text into a token sequence which is called **Tokenization**. Tokenization can alleviate the Out-of-Vocabulary (OOV) problem and reduce vocabulary size by reusing the elemental tokens. After tokenization, code  $x$  is represented by a sequence of tokens, namely,  $x = (s_0, ..., s_j, ..., s_l)$  where  $s_i$  is one token. Then, the code vocabulary dictionary is built by using all the appeared tokens  $s_i$ , denoted  $\mathbb{V}$ . After that, every word (token) in  $\mathbb{V}$  is embedded by learned vectors  $v_i$  with dimension  $d$ . Here, we use  $E^{|\mathbb{V}| \times d}$  to represent the embedding matrix for  $\mathbb{V}$ . Finally,  $x$  can be converted into an embedding matrix  $R^{l \times d} = (v_0, ..., v_j, ..., v_l)$ . After this code encoding, pre-trained code models based on the transformer take the matrix  $R^{l \times d}$  as inputs and learn the contextual representation of  $x$  for downstream tasks via Masked Language Modeling (MLM) or Causal Language Modeling (CLM).




Figure 1: One code model demo on the downstream task

Figure 1 illustrates the main steps of the code processing models for the downstream classification tasks. First, we tokenize the textual code  $x$  into a token sequence that is represented in a discrete integer space. Then, we map the discrete sequence ids into the token vector space  $R^{l \times d}$ . Next, we feed the token vectors into the

task model  $f(\theta)$ .  $f(\theta)$  is built on top of pre-trained models. Finally, we can predict the domain probabilities after fine-tuning.

## 2.2 Problem Statement

Since many critical code tasks are classification problems, e.g., defect prediction and code clone detection. In this paper, we focus on the adversarial attack for code classification tasks. Considering a code classification task, we use  $f(x; \theta) \rightarrow y : \mathbf{R}^{l \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} = \{i | 0 \leq i \leq k\}$  to denote the victim model that maps a code token sequence  $x$  to a label  $y$  from a label set  $\mathbb{C}$  with size  $k$ , where  $l$  is the sequence length and  $d$  is the token vector dimension, and  $i$  is one integer. By querying dictionary dense embedding  $E^{|\mathbb{V} \times d|}$ , a code token sequence  $x = (s_0, \dots, s_j, \dots, s_l)$ , is vectorized into  $\mathbf{R}^{l \times d}$ . Adversarial attacks for code models create an adversarial example  $x'$  by modifying some vulnerable tokens of  $x$  with a limited maximum perturbation  $\epsilon$  to change the correct label  $y$  to a wrong label  $y'$ . Simply, we get a perturbed  $x'$  by modifying some tokens in  $(s_0, \dots, s_j, \dots, s_l)$  such that  $f(x'; \theta) \neq f(x; \theta)$  where  $x' = x + \sigma$ ,  $\sigma$  represent perturbation execution,  $\sigma$  is the perturbation code transformation for  $(s_0, \dots, s_j, \dots, s_l)$ , and  $\sigma \leq \epsilon$ . Besides, we target the more practical attacking scenario – black-box attack. We assume we cannot access the model parameters and can only utilize the final output of model  $f(x; \theta)$  to conduct the attack.

## 3 METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Motivation

Before introducing the details, we demonstrate what is behind RNNS, and explain its motivation. It is a fact that machine learning algorithms learn the correlation between the input and the output. It implicitly means that the input change also has some correlation with the output change. For example, from Figure 1, it can be seen there is a correlation between the token vector space and the domain (downstream task) probability space, which  $f(\theta)$  could learn. As a result, changes in the token vector space can be reflected in the domain probability space and vice versa. This observation motivates us to use the changing relationship between the domain probability space and the token vector space to find adversarial identifiers in the token vector space.

Besides this motivated observation, the pattern-based generated adversarial methods [8, 18, 28, 40] have fixed patterns, which are easy to be detected, i.e., always reformatting the for-loop into the while loop or inserting a dumpy statement in the head of the tail of the code. The AI-based generated adversarial methods [8, 38, 41] also contain some hidden statistic patterns of the word frequencies that can be used to detect [7, 14]. Instead of pattern-based or AI-based generation techniques, we search in real name space with some stochastically to find the adversarial examples. Our algorithm is black-box which stimulates a real attacking scenario. Figure 2 demonstrates our motivation and differences with the existing work.

### 3.2 Representaion Nearest Neighbor Search (RNNS)


Figure 3 shows the workflow of our approach, RNNS. Generally, it has two main parts, 1) indicate which variable (attack position location) we should attack ((1), (2)), and 2) search which adversarial tokens we should use for variable renaming ((3)-(7)). Algorithm 1 shows the details of our approach. More specifically, RNNS consists of the following steps.

- (1) *Variable Collection*. We implement a tool **Variable Extractor** (denoted as *VarExtractor*) based on AST to obtain a list of the variables as well as their corresponding positions in the code input (step (1)). All these collected variables will be seen as candidates for attack.
- (2) *Variable Ranking*. we rank all the variables based on the uncertainty of outputs via **Uncertainty Ranking Estimator** (step (2)). We randomly replace each variable with different-length names and measure the variance of the output to measure its uncertainty. Given one code  $x$ ,  $\forall v \in x$ , we replace the variable name  $v$  with different-length names multiple times and get a set of mutated codes, denoted  $M$ .


$$uncertainty_v = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C variance(P_i)$$

, where  $P_i = \{p_i(m) | \forall m \in M\}$ ,  $C$  is the number of labels, and *variance* denotes the standard variance function.  $M$  is larger and more diverse, and the estimation  $uncertainty_v$  is closer to the real value. We rank the variables in the descending order of their uncertainties, denoted as *Rank\_Uncertainty*.

- (3) *Variable Picking*. We pick the variable with the highest uncertainty and compute its vector representation by **Variable Name Encoder** (denoted as *emb* at the step (3)). We use the pre-trained CodeBERT model as a Variable Name Encoder without any domain knowledge about downstream tasks.
- (4) *Variable Replacement*. We query the real variable dataset and randomly select  $K$  substitutes for this variable (denoted as *RandomSelector* at step (4)). The real variable dataset consists of all variable names from the task dataset. After that, we rename the variable by using these substitutes and generate  $K$  new code data.
- (5) *Attack*. After replacement, we evaluate these  $K$  generated code data and choose the best one by **Replacement Evaluator** (denoted as *Get\_Cur\_Best* at the step (5)). *Get\_Cur\_Best* computes the probability for each replacement and returns the variable with the lowest probability. Then, we check if the label is changed compared to the original one. If it is changed, the attack is successful, and we stop attacking and return this adversarial code. Otherwise, we will check if the confidence of the victim model on this new data for the ground truth label decreases. If the confidence does not decrease, we move to the next variable in the ranked list and skip to step (3). If we find the victim model reduces its confidence for the ground truth label, we update our search seed by **Search Seed Generator** (step (6)) and query the top- $K$  replacement set again (denoted as *Get\_topK* at the step (7)). *Get\_topK* returns the top- $K$  with



### Figure 2: Motivation of RNNs



the highest similarity to the search seed (denoted as  $e_{tmp}$ ). Note that we continue the loop ⑤ -> ⑥ -> ⑦ -> ⑤ until we find one adversarial example, or we reach the maximum loop iterations and move to the next variable in the ranked list (step ③).

In Algorithm 1, we add comments that map the pseudocode to the steps in Figure 3. When RNNS evaluates adversarial candidates at the steps (4) and (7), it has **two constraints**:

- *similarity distance*,

$$1 - \text{similarity}(v_{adv}, v_{org}) < \epsilon \quad (1)$$

- *variable length change,*

$$|len(v_{adv}) - len(v_{orq})| < \delta \quad (2)$$

,where  $v_{adv}$  is the adversarial variable and  $v_{org}$  is the original variable. We use cosine similarity that can measure the angle of two

vectors. The successful adversarial examples have to satisfy both at the same time.

RNNS has some hyperparameters, as shown at the beginning of Algorithm 1.  $max\_itr$  defines the maximum attacking iterations.  $K$  is the number of adversarial candidates we consider at each trial.  $\alpha$  is used to smooth the moving/changing direction.  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$  are used to limit the maximum perturbation. The maximum token similarity distance should be within  $\epsilon$ , and the maximum name length difference should be less than  $\delta$ .  $dist$  is the distance metric, and the default is cosine distance because we are more interested in the direction similarity. RNNS is independent of victim downstream-task models. We use **Variable Name Encoder** (denoted as  $emb$ ) that maps one variable  $var$  into an independent token vector space, denoted as  $e_{var}$ . Search Space  $\mathbb{S}$  consists of variable names from the actual code.

Search Seed Generator (6) is one core step to guide the search direction.  $e_{var}$  is the model-independent vector representation of  $var$  from **Variable Name Encoder**.  $\Delta e$  is the difference between

the current intermediate variable state  $e_{cur}$  and the last intermediate variable state  $e_{pre}$ , defined by  $\Delta e \leftarrow e_{cur} - e_{pre}$  at line 14.  $\Delta e_{smo}$  is the smooth history memory for  $\Delta e$ , and it is initialized at the first attacking iteration (line 16), and updated by  $(1 - \alpha)\Delta e_{smo} + \alpha\Delta e$  (line 18), where  $\alpha$  is the smooth rate between 0 and 1.

Depending on if using the change direction ( $\Delta e$ ) of the search seed or if using the change direction historical information ( $\Delta e_{smo}$ ) at the step ⑥, our approach RNNS has three variants, RNNS-Smooth, RNNS-Direct, and RNNS-Raw. RNNS-Smooth combines the current change direction of the search seed and its change direction history. RNNS-Direct only considers the current change direction. RNNS-Raw does not use either of them.

By modifying Algorithm 1 (RNNS-Smooth), we can get the other two variants, RNNS-Direct and RNNS-Raw. First, RNNS-Direct does not use the history information  $\Delta e_{smo}$  and directly use  $\Delta e$  to update  $e_{tmp} \leftarrow e_{cur} + \Delta e$  (line 19). RNNS-Direct is equal to RNNS-Smooth when  $\alpha = 1$ . RNNS-Raw drops  $\Delta e$ ,  $e_{tmp} \leftarrow e_{cur}$  (line 19). Figure 4 demonstrates their difference. Both RNNS-Smooth and RNNS-Direct use  $\Delta e$  while RNNS-Smooth introduces the history of  $\Delta e$  for smoothing.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS SETUP

**Dataset and Model.** To study the effectiveness and efficiency of RNNS, we conduct experiments on three (3) popular programming languages, i.e., C, Python, and Java, which can reduce the evaluation bias caused by the different programming languages. For the datasets, we consider six (6) widely studied open-source datasets that cover four important code tasks. Specifically, BigCloneBench [33] is one code clone detection dataset consisting of 98102 Java program pairs named Clone. Devign [47] is a C programming language dataset used for vulnerability detection, named Defect. It supports 27318 code files collected from different GitHub repositories. For authorship prediction, we use the dataset provided by [5]. Besides, we consider three problem-solving classification tasks, Java250, Python800, and C1000, provided by ProjectCodeNet [27]. For all the datasets (except for authorship prediction which does not have enough data samples), we follow the original papers to split the data into the training set, validation set, and test set. The training set is used to fine-tune the programming language models, the validation set is used to help find the best model during training. Finally, the test set is used to measure the performance of the model. Authorship prediction only has two split parts, training data and test data. We conduct the adversarial attack on the test data.

For the programming language model, we follow the previous work [38] and investigate two pre-trained models CodeBERT [11], and GraphCodeBERT [16]. Besides, we add one recently proposed and more powerful model CodeT5 [36] in our study. In total, for six (6) datasets, we prepare (fine-tune) 18 models as our victim models. Table 1 summarizes the details of our used datasets and fine-tuned models.

**Evaluation Metric.** To evaluate the effectiveness of adversarial attack methods, we employ the commonly used attack success rate (ASR) as the measurement. A higher ASR means that the attack

method can generate more adversarial examples. ASR is defined as:

$$ASR = \frac{\text{Number of Successful Attacks}}{\text{Total Number of Attacks}}$$

To evaluate the efficiency of the attack methods, we use query times (QT) to check the average number of querying the victim model for one attack. A smaller QT means the attack method can find the adversarial examples by visiting victim models in a fewer query times number. Finally, we use the change of replaced-variable length and the number of replaced variables to study the quality/perturbation of adversarial examples. A smaller score means the attack method can generate adversarial examples with less perturbation injection.

**Hyperparameter Setting.** We set the maximum iteration  $max\_itr = 6$ , the number of candidates  $K = 60$ , the smooth rate  $\alpha = 0.2$ , the maximum length change  $\delta = 4$  and the maximum cosine distance  $\epsilon = 0.15$ . We tune these parameters on Devign dataset with the two criteria 1) the performance is acceptable and 2) the cost cannot be large. It needs the expert experience like setting machine learning algorithms. The search space  $\mathbb{S}$  consists of the variable names from the task dataset. All variants of RNNS use the same settings.

**Baseline.** We compare RNNS with two SOTA black-box attack baselines, MHM [41] and NaturalAttack (ALERT) [38]. MHM is a sampling search-based black-box attack that generates the substitutes from the vocabulary based on lexical rules for identifiers. Here, MHM employs synthesized tokens as the candidates of substitutes, which could introduce meaningless variable names. ALERT is a recently proposed attack method that combines greedy attack and genetic algorithm to search the substitutes. Mention that ALERT has a different goal from our approach and MHM. The basic target of ALERT is to achieve the trade-off between the naturalness of generated adversarial examples and ASR. While the goal of RNNS and MHM is to try to achieve high ASR. RNNS uses the variable names from real code under the constraints to satisfy naturalness as far as possible.

**Implementation.** We implement our approach in PyTorch and run all experiments on 32G-v100 GPUs. We reuse the source code from the baselines. We provide the link to our implementation in the end of this paper.

### 4.1 Research Questions (RQs)

To demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of our method, we compare RNNS with SOTA attacks to answer the following four (4) research questions (RQs). RQ1 is used to measure the effectiveness of RNNS. RQ2 explores the quality of generated adversarial examples to study the practical usage of RNNS. RQ3 studies how the different constraints affect RNNS. RQ4 studies the robustness of our approach to the defended models.

- **RQ1:** How is RNNS compared with SOTA black-box adversarial attacks (MHM and ALERT)?
- **RQ2:** What is the perturbation of the generated samples in terms of the change length and the number of the replaced variables?
- **RQ3:** How do the constraints affect RNNS?

**Algorithm 1:** RNNS-Smooth

---

**Hyperparameter:** maximum attacking iteration  $max\_itr$ , maximum candidates  $K$ , direction smooth rate  $\alpha$ , maximum distance  $\epsilon$ , maximum length difference  $\delta$ , distance metrics  $dist$


**Input:** code  $x$  with ground label  $g$ , search space  $\mathbb{S}$ , victim model  $f(\theta)$ , independent token encoder  $emb$

**Output:** adversarial example  $x'$ , attacking success  $is\_suc$

**Initialization:**  
 $x' \leftarrow x, i \leftarrow 1, p_g^{pre} = f_g(x)$

- 1  $List(var, posList) \leftarrow VarExtractor(x)$  // step ① extracts the variables and their positions.
- 2  $List(var, posList) \leftarrow Rank\_Uncertainty(List(var, posList), x, f(\theta))$  // step ② ranks the variables.
- 3 **for**  $(var, posList) \in List(var, posList)$  **do**
- 4    $e_{var} \leftarrow emb(var), \Delta e_{smo} \leftarrow 0, e_{pre} \leftarrow e_{var}, var^{pre} \leftarrow var$  // step ③ embed the variable to a vector.
- 5    $topK \leftarrow RandomSelector(\mathbb{S}, K, e_{var}, \epsilon, \delta, dist, len(var))$  // step ④ initialize  $topK$  limited by Eq 1&2.
- 6   **while**  $i \leq max\_itr$  **do**
- 7      $is\_suc, var^{cur}, p_g^{cur} = Get\_Cur\_Best(f(\theta), x', g, posList, topK)$  // step ⑤
- 8     **if**  $is\_suc$  **then**
- 9        $x' \leftarrow Replace(x', var, var^{cur})$
- 10      **return**  $x', is\_suc$
- 11     **end**
- 12     **else if**  $p_g^{cur} - p_g^{pre} < 0$  **then**
- 13        $e_{cur} \leftarrow emb(var^{cur})$  // step ⑥ includes line 13-19 to update the search seed.
- 14        $\Delta e \leftarrow e_{cur} - e_{pre}$
- 15       **if**  $i == 1$  **then**
- 16           $\Delta e_{smo} \leftarrow \Delta e$
- 17       **end**
- 18        $\Delta e_{smo} \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)\Delta e_{smo} + \alpha\Delta e$  // If  $\alpha = 1$ , it is RNNS-Direct.
- 19        $e_{tmp} \leftarrow e_{cur} + \Delta e_{smo}$
- 20        $topK \leftarrow Get\_topK(e_{tmp}, K, \mathbb{S}, e_{var}, \epsilon, \delta, dist, len(var))$  // step ⑦ limited by Equation 1&2
- 21        $p_g^{pre} \leftarrow p_g^{cur}$
- 22        $e_{pre} \leftarrow e_{cur}$
- 23        $var^{pre} \leftarrow var^{cur}$
- 24        $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 25     **end**
- 26     **else**
- 27        $x' \leftarrow Replace(x', var, var^{pre})$
- 28       **break**
- 29     **end**
- 30   **end**
- 31 **end**

---

**Figure 4: Difference among RNNS-Smooth, RNNS-Direct, RNNS-Raw**

- **RQ4:** 1). What is the performance of RNNS when it attacks the defended models? 2). Can we use the adversarial example to improve the model robustness?

For **RQ1**, we compare RNNS with two SOTA methods MHM [41] and NaturalAttack (ALERT) [38] on six (6) datasets and 18 victim

models that we considered. We should notice that ALERT tends to balance the trade-off between ASR and its claimed naturalness of generated code. ALERT compares itself with one modified MHM which also follows the naturalness condition. Different from ALERT, the goal of RNNS is to achieve higher ASR from the real variable

**Table 1: Datasets and Victim Model Performance (Accuracy, %)**

Task	Train / Val / Test	CodeBERT	GraphCodeBERT	CodeT5
Defect	21,854 / 2,732 / 2,732	63.76	63.65	67.02
Clone	90,102 / 4,000 / 4,000	96.97	97.36	97.84
Authorship	528 / - / 132	82.57	77.27	88.63
C1000	320,000 / 80,000 / 100,000	82.53	83.79	84.46
Python800	153,600 / 38,400 / 48,000	96.39	96.29	96.79
Java250	48,000 / 11,909 / 15,000	96.91	97.27	97.72

names collected from actual code. Thus, in our experiment, we use the original MHM as the baseline. We count attack success rate (ASR) and average query times (QT) to one victim model to evaluate the effectiveness of attack methods. We repeat the experiments at least three times and report the median results. High ASR and low QT are preferred.

For RQ2, we conduct a study about the quality of the adversarial examples to check if RNNS can generate *real* code, e.g., avoiding naively increasing the variable name length. To do so, firstly, we count the average length of the original variable and adversarial variables. Then, we compute the mean and variances of their difference. Besides, we also compute the average number of the replaced variables for the successful attack. Low values mean the inputs are modified less, and high qualities.

For RQ3, we do an ablation study to check how each component contributes to RNNS. We remove two constraints of RNNS, i.e., Equation 1 and Equation 2. We name RNNS without any constraint as RNNS-Unlimited. We compare RNNS-Unlimited and RNNS-Smooth on all datasets and all models with respect to ASR and QT.

For RQ4.1, we employ RNNS and MHM to attack the three (3) defended models provided by ALERT [38]. These models are prepared by using adversarial fine-tuning which is a general approach to training robust models. The adversarial variables generated by ALERT are close to the actual data because it uses the masked mechanism of pre-trained code models to generate the variable substitutes. RNNS uses the real variable names as the search space. Thus, normally, these defended models are naturally more robust to RNNS than MHM. This means that attacking such defended models can benefit MHM in some way.

For RQ4.2, we use the adversarial examples from RNNS-Smooth and use the contrastive adversarial learning to retrain the victim models of CodeBERT. We use the top-3 datasets with the smallest training size, Defect, Authorship and Java250. We generate the adversarial examples on the whole training dataset for them.

## 5 RESULTS ANALYSIS

### 5.1 Attack Effectiveness and Efficiency (RQ1)

We compare three variants of RNNS mentioned in Section 4.1 with two state-of-the-art black box attacks MHM [41] and ALERT [38]. Table 2 shows the comparison results where row *Count* means how many times this method achieves better results than MHM [41] and ALERT [38]. Bold-font numbers in Table 2 means they are the best ones or better than the baselines. First, we compare each variant of RNNS. From the results, we can see that RNNS-Smooth is 18/18 times better than the baselines, and the query times are the lowest or quite close to the lowest values as shown with the marked

triangle in Table 2. RNNS-Raw needs more query times (QT). We can see that considering the effectiveness, RNNS outperforms ALERT and MHM in all cases. Specifically, both baselines have zero (0) best ASR for all victim models and all datasets. Especially, MHM and ALERT fail to attack GraphCodeBERT on BigClone dataset, and only have 9.58% and 10.4% ASR respectively, while RNNS has more than 40% ASR. RNNS has almost two times larger ASR than MHM on Java250+CodeT5 and Python800+CodeT5. Besides, we find that RNNS with the direction  $\Delta e$  can improve the attacking success rate (ASR) and reduce the query times, achieving 18 higher ASR and 10 lower QT among 18 attacking tasks than the two baselines. The lowest QTs achieved by ALERT and MHM are 2 and 6, respectively. Both are smaller than any version of RNNS. It should be noticed that if we individually compare any of the three RNNS variants with ALERT and MHM with respect to QT, ALERT only has two (2) cases and MHM has six (6) cases that are lower than each RNNS variant among the total 18 cases. We also find that ALERT has much higher QTs than others about the code clone task, and the victim models based on CodeT5 are more robust to RNNS, which has lower ASRs than CodeBERT and GraphCodeBERT on all tasks except the defection detection. Considering the efficiency only, we can see that RNNS achieves competitive results with baselines.

**Answer to RQ1:** RNNS outperforms MHM and ALERT in terms of ASR and QT. RNNS-Smooth is the best one among three RNNS variants.

### 5.2 Perturbation of Adversarial Example (RQ2)

Table 3 and Table 4 show our study results. Less length change or fewer number of replaced variables means smaller perturbation introduced and a higher quality of generated code. In Table 3, the 2nd, 5th, and 8th columns are the average length for original variables (named *Var Len*) that are replaced. The 3rd, 6th, and 9th columns are the average lengths for adversarial variables (named *Adv Var Len*). The 4th, 7th, and 10th columns are the average and variance (*mean ± variance*) of the absolute length difference between original variables and adversarial variables (named *Difference*). We observe that MHM prefers to replace the long-length variables while RNNS likes replacing short-length variables if we compare the second and fifth columns. Meanwhile, the change of variable length from RNNS is less than MHM. MHM introduces the average length difference of 3.39-6.82 while RNNS only has 2.02-2.54. MHM has much higher variances than RNNS in the length change. However, ALERT uses shorter adversarial variable names than RNNS with less change because it uses the pre-trained model to generate the replacements that are close to the replaced variables.

Table 4 statistically shows the number of replaced variables. It can be seen that RNNS replaces around an average of 3.6 variables with a smaller variance of around (3.4-4.6) while MHM needs to modify about an average of 5.4 variables with a larger variance ( $\geq 11.14$ ). ALERT also replaces more variables to attack models than RNNS and MHM.

Figure 5 shows one example that RNNS, MHM, and ALERT attack successfully from the Java250 dataset. From the left to right, they are the original code, the adversarial example generated by RNNS, the

**Table 2: Comparing Results with MHM, and ALERT, ASR %. Count: the number of best results achieved.**

Task+Model	ALERT		MHM		RNNS-Smooth		RNNS-Direct		RNNS-Raw	
	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT
Clone+CodeBert	28.67	2155.39	39.66	972.15	<b>46.50</b>	<b>666.48</b>	<b>47.07</b>	<b>967.21</b>	<b>47.79</b>	<b>964.25</b>
Clone+GraphCodeBert	10.4	1466.68	<u>9.58</u>	<b>490.99</b>	<b>41.28</b>	▷ 1122.01	<b>42.04</b>	1121.81	<b>42.24</b>	1118.28
Clone+CodeT5	29.2	2359.70	38.79	1069.06	<b>39.61</b>	<b>895.79</b>	38.59	<b>988.52</b>	<b>38.99</b>	<b>1001.93</b>
Defect+CodeBert	52.29	1079.68	50.51	862.18	<b>69.18</b>	<b>588.35</b>	<b>69.18</b>	<b>595.80</b>	<b>67.37</b>	<b>602.46</b>
Defect+GraphCodeBert	74.29	621.77	75.19	539.93	<b>81.63</b>	<b>404.73</b>	<b>83.67</b>	<b>414.58</b>	<b>82.73</b>	<b>410.84</b>
Defect+CodeT5	76.66	721.02	86.51	<b>344.08</b>	<b>89.45</b>	▷ 344.29	<b>89.21</b>	890.80	<b>88.69</b>	891.81
Authorship+CodeBert	34.98	<b>682.57</b>	64.70	775.11	<b>73.39</b>	1029.59	<b>75.22</b>	1002.26	<b>76.14</b>	972.82
Authorship+GraphCodeBert	58.82	1227.36	75.49	<b>632.10</b>	<b>80.39</b>	▷ 696.64	<b>78.43</b>	709.90	<b>77.45</b>	715.87
Authorship+CodeT5	64.95	1078.40	66.97	<b>715.89</b>	<b>71.79</b>	▷ 970.44	<b>68.37</b>	981.98	<b>70.94</b>	981.05
Java250+CodeBert	50.5	958.96	74.03	961.60	<b>75.12</b>	<b>815.91</b>	<b>75.85</b>	<b>798.02</b>	<b>73.58</b>	<b>825.17</b>
Java250+GraphCodeBert	46.74	1026.15	46.05	946.52	<b>72.30</b>	<b>853.74</b>	<b>73.23</b>	<b>851.30</b>	<b>72.51</b>	<b>863.49</b>
Java250+CodeT5	52.04	1189.42	30.59	1107.95	<b>63.80</b>	<b>1049.46</b>	<b>64.85</b>	<b>1034.10</b>	<b>62.34</b>	1130.23
Python800+CodeBert	58.3	513.63	56.67	919.37	<b>77.88</b>	▷ 514.19	<b>79.75</b>	<b>503.82</b>	<b>78.40</b>	516.34
Python800+GraphCodeBert	51.87	577.70	54.15	917.92	<b>71.42</b>	▷ 730.14	<b>71.94</b>	<b>723.12</b>	<b>69.04</b>	760.71
Python800+CodeT5	52.84	777.20	36.95	1127.44	<b>69.07</b>	<b>662.28</b>	<b>69.70</b>	<b>658.50</b>	<b>67.73</b>	<b>666.61</b>
C1000+CodeBert	53.5	525.43	59.75	<b>340.88</b>	<b>72.96</b>	537.76	<b>72.84</b>	538.59	<b>71.75</b>	547.03
C1000+GraphCodeBert	52.68	<b>566.18</b>	45.93	837.09	<b>72.23</b>	634.27	<b>68.77</b>	634.11	<b>72.47</b>	636.37
C1000+CodeT5	47.86	843.33	36.45	<b>668.15</b>	<b>59.00</b>	697.06	<b>59.12</b>	689.56	<b>59.24</b>	707.90
Count	0/18	2/18	0/18	6/18	18/18	8/18	17/18	10/18	18/18	7/18

**Table 3: Replaced-Variable Length Comparison (*mean ± variance*)**

Task+Model	RNNS-Smooth			MHM			ALERT		
	Var Len	Adv Var Len	Difference	Var Len	Adv Var Len	Difference	Var Len	Adv Var Len	Difference
Clone+CodeBert	6.12	6.79	2.35 ± 4.5	6.47	10.6	6.34 ± 10.98	5.91	6.21	1.32 ± 2.02
Clone+GraphCodeBert	6.32	6.97	2.54 ± 6.43	6.58	10.41	6.82 ± 21.67	5.5	5.93	1.45 ± 2.49
Clone+CodeT5	6.45	6.69	2.51 ± 8.3	6.46	10.46	6.17 ± 25.78	6.25	6.61	1.32 ± 2.72
Defect+CodeBert	4.64	5.44	2.08 ± 2.49	4.44	9.59	6.57 ± 28.78	4.85	5.06	1.36 ± 1.93
Defect+GraphCodeBert	4.08	5.34	2.13 ± 1.83	4.37	9.73	6.48 ± 26.51	4.47	5.22	1.33 ± 1.83
Defect+CodeT5	3.95	5.17	2.03 ± 1.93	4.33	9.81	6.59 ± 29.98	4.36	5.01	1.27 ± 1.57
Authorship+CodeBert	3.81	5.18	2.28 ± 1.56	3.97	7.94	5.45 ± 16.72	4.42	5.35	1.4 ± 2.25
Authorship+GraphCodeBert	3.69	5.23	2.36 ± 1.71	4.39	7.64	5.24 ± 15.38	3.74	4.46	1.22 ± 1.82
Authorship+CodeT5	3.95	5.18	2.03 ± 2.66	3.95	7.98	5.59 ± 20.94	3.81	4.5	1.22 ± 1.62
Java250+CodeBert	2.35	4.22	2.11 ± 1.02	3.21	6.5	4.34 ± 15.2	3.22	3.65	0.937 ± 1.63
Java250+GraphCodeBert	2.48	4.31	2.13 ± 1.07	3.13	6.59	4.42 ± 14.84	3.05	3.5	0.979 ± 1.54
Java250+CodeT5	2.76	4.47	2.1 ± 1.17	3.2	6.54	4.33 ± 14.6	3.16	7.31	4.41 ± 18.73
Python800+CodeBert	1.5	3.54	2.21 ± 1.02	1.97	5.11	3.64 ± 9.06	1.78	2.27	0.64 ± 1.34
Python800+GraphCodeBert	1.88	3.9	2.18 ± 0.78	1.99	6.01	4.46 ± 16.52	1.8	2.33	0.76 ± 1.3
Python800+CodeT5	1.65	3.59	2.13 ± 0.95	1.97	4.95	3.49 ± 8.18	1.88	5.84	4.1 ± 12.64
C1000+CodeBert	1.58	3.44	2.08 ± 0.88	2.41	5.05	3.65 ± 12.02	2.13	2.52	0.67 ± 1.17
C1000+GraphCodeBert	1.6	3.59	2.1 ± 0.85	2.39	5.35	3.9 ± 12.98	2.18	2.67	0.66 ± 1.23
C1000+CodeBert	1.38	3.33	2.02 ± 0.85	2.36	4.82	3.39 ± 10.98	2.1	6.56	4.74 ± 13.24

**Table 4: Replaced-Variable Number Comparison, *mean ± variance***

Task	CodeBERT			GraphCodeBERT			CodeT5		
	RNNS-Smooth	MHM	ALERT	RNNS-Smooth	MHM	ALERT	RNNS-Smooth	MHM	ALERT
Clone	3.55 ± 4.6	6.72 ± 16.57	6.86 ± 18.85	4.12 ± 4.94	6.21 ± 15.13	6.95 ± 18.99	3.43 ± 5	5.68 ± 14.01	7.65 ± 25.57
Defect	3.39 ± 4.96	2.78 ± 7.89	3.49 ± 3.99	2.67 ± 1.75	2.84 ± 9.5	4.1 ± 11.05	2.51 ± 1.45	2.16 ± 3.58	3.49 ± 3.99
Authorship	4.24 ± 7.47	7.52 ± 25.82	6.6 ± 22.96	3.65 ± 3.32	6.67 ± 22.29	7.75 ± 33.12	4.39 ± 9	5.72 ± 13.02	6.06 ± 18.74
Java250	3.87 ± 4.7	7.11 ± 21.18	7.82 ± 28.96	3.87 ± 4.25	6.41 ± 16.24	7.83 ± 25.06	4.71 ± 6.87	7.04 ± 15.29	8.92 ± 25.97
Python800	3.06 ± 1.87	5.21 ± 12.28	4.96 ± 8.47	4.12 ± 3.68	5 ± 10.83	4.63 ± 6.76	3.57 ± 3.04	5.29 ± 13.51	6.18 ± 11.45
C1000	3 ± 1.86	4.42 ± 7.49	4.13 ± 5.59	3.37 ± 2.38	5.14 ± 7.3	4.88 ± 6.24	3.39 ± 2.48	5.2 ± 7.43	5.43 ± 6.99
mean	<b>3.52 ± 4.24</b>	5.63 ± 15.21	5.65 ± 14.80	<b>3.63 ± 3.39</b>	5.38 ± 13.55	6.02 ± 16.87	<b>3.67 ± 4.64</b>	5.18 ± 11.14	6.29 ± 15.45

adversarial example from MHM, and the adversarial example from ALERT. The changes are highlighted by shadow markers. RNNS

only renames one variable **b** to **h**, ALERT renames two variables,



<pre> public static void main(String[] args) {     Scanner obj = new Scanner(System.in);     int a = obj.nextInt();     int b = obj.nextInt();     int out = 1;     int ans = 0;     while ( out &lt; b ){         out--;         out = out + a;         ans++;     }     System.out.println(ans); } </pre> <p style="text-align: center;">Original Code</p>	<pre> public static void main(String[] args) {     Scanner obj = new Scanner(System.in);     int a = obj.nextInt();     int h = obj.nextInt();     int out = 1;     int ans = 0;     while ( out &lt; h ){         out--;         out = out + a;         ans++;     }     System.out.println(ans); } </pre> <p style="text-align: center;">Adversarial Code from RNNS</p>	<pre> public static void main(String[] args) {     Scanner FastScanner = new Scanner(System.in);     int tdigit = FastScanner.nextInt();     int colArr = FastScanner.nextInt();     int tempOp = 1;     int number_array = 0;     while (tempOp &lt; colArr){         tempOp--;         tempOp = tempOp + tdigit;         number_array++;     }     System.out.println(number_array); } </pre> <p style="text-align: center;">Adversarial Code from MHM</p>	<pre> public static void main(String[] args) {     Scanner obj = new Scanner(System.in);     int MATRIX = obj.nextInt();     int DAYS = obj.nextInt();     int out = 1;     int ans = 0;     while ( out &lt; DAYS ){         out--;         out = out + MATRIX;         ans++;     }     System.out.println(ans); } </pre> <p style="text-align: center;">Adversarial Code from ALERT</p>
--	---	--	--

Figure 5: Case study. Original vs. RNNS vs. MHM vs. ALERT

while MHM almost renames all variables and also prefers longer names.

**Answer to RQ2:** RNNS does not increase the variable length and variable number much. Although the variable altered length is one constraint of RNNS-smooth, the number of replaced variables is less than the baselines. It introduces smaller perturbations into code than MHN and a similar level of perturbations with ALERT in terms of variable length change and the number of replaced variables.

### 5.3 Ablation Study (RQ3)

Table 5 shows the results about RNNS-Unlimited and RNNS-Smooth after we remove the two constraints. For the three pre-trained models, CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, and CodeT5, RNNS-Unlimited gets the first place for all the tasks in terms of ASR. ASR can be improved by a maximum of 8.35% and a minimum of about 2% after removing limitations. For QT, RNNS-Unlimited only loses 3 times among 18 evaluations. The improvement of RNNS-Unlimited is not surprising with respect to ASR and QT. Because RNNS-Unlimited can search the adversarial examples in the non-similar real names and use very long variable names. One interesting finding is that CodeT5 is more robust than CodeBERT and GraphCodeBERT. Expect the task Defect, RNNS achieves lower ASRs on CodeT5 than CodeBERT and GraphCodeBERT. We can get the same conclusion from Table 2.

**Answer to RQ3:** RNNS-Unlimited requires less query times and achieves higher ASR in general than RNNS with constraints. Without any constraint, RNNS can find adversarial examples more easily.

### 5.4 Attack Defended Model (RQ4)

**RQ4.1.** Table 6 presents the results. RNNS-Unlimited is one RNNS variant in that we remove all constraints. We can see that RNNS outperforms MHM in two (2) tasks (defect detection, authorship), and MHM is better in one (1) task (code clone). One interesting finding is that ASRs are increased considering Defect+CodeBERT for RNNS and MHM, compared with the results before adversarial training (Table 2 and Table 5). This phenomenon indicates that the adversarial examples generated by ALERT are not useful for

improving the robustness of code models for defect prediction tasks. It could be our future work to do a deeper analysis for exploring the potential reasons.

**RQ4.2.** Table 7 demonstrates the re-training results about the victim models of CodeBERT through contrastive adversarial learning. The second column is the model test performance after retraining. Compared with Table 2 about the three datasets (Authorship, Defect and Java250) and CodeBERT, we can find that the adversarial examples can improve the model robustness through the contrastive adversarial retraining.

**Answer to RQ4:** RNNS outperforms MHM in 2 out of 3 cases with a by up to 32.07% higher ASR when attacking defended models. The adversarial examples generated by RNNS can improve the model robustness.

## 6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

*External validity:* The main threat to *this validity* is that if our approach can be generalized into other Software Engineering tasks and pre-trained models. To alleviate this threat, we consider multiple pre-trained models, multiple programming languages and six (6) different Software Engineering tasks. We also consider two types of pre-trained models. CodeBERT and GraphCodeBERT are based on the encoder of Transformer. CodeT5 is the encoder-decoder of Transformer. We repeat all experiments at least three times.

*Internal validity:* The threat refers to the technique implementation. To reduce the threat, we reuse the downstream task models from CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT and CodeT5. We implement our approach in PyTorch. One person is responsible for implementation and the other person reviews the design of the implementation. We make our code publicly available for examination, replication and reuse.

*Construct validity:* This threat is about the gap between the experimental observation and the facts of our approach. To mitigate the validity, we fine-tune the victim models to get good performance for all tasks with respect to Accuracy. We use four (4) metrics to compare different approaches, attack success rate (ASR), query times (QT), length change of the variables and a number of replaced variables. To reduce randomness, we repeat our experiments multiple times.

**Table 5: Removing Constraints, ASR %**

Task	CodeBERT				GraphCodeBERT				CodeT5			
	RNNS-Unlimited		RNNS-Smooth		RNNS-Unlimited		RNNS-Smooth		RNNS-Unlimited		RNNS-Smooth	
	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT
Defect	<b>72.29</b>	590.98	69.18	<b>588.35</b>	<b>87.77</b>	<b>381.82</b>	81.63	404.73	<b>91.64</b>	<b>338.41</b>	89.45	344.29
Clone	<b>50.66</b>	955.97	46.5	<b>666.48</b>	<b>48.16</b>	<b>1105.11</b>	41.28	1122.01	<b>41.38</b>	920.65	39.61	<b>895.79</b>
Authorship	<b>91.74</b>	<b>447.68</b>	73.39	1029.59	<b>91.17</b>	<b>438.69</b>	80.39	696.64	<b>88.88</b>	<b>620.56</b>	71.79	970.44
C1000	<b>74.7</b>	<b>502.02</b>	72.96	537.76	<b>76.82</b>	<b>498.64</b>	72.23	634.27	<b>61.96</b>	<b>704.95</b>	59.00	697.06
Python800	<b>83.9</b>	<b>460.92</b>	77.88	514.19	<b>79</b>	<b>496.30</b>	71.42	730.14	<b>72.69</b>	<b>646.59</b>	69.07	662.28
Java250	<b>79.7</b>	<b>760.97</b>	75.12	815.91	<b>81.94</b>	<b>744.57</b>	72.3	853.74	<b>75.52</b>	<b>910.97</b>	63.8	1049.46
Count	6/6	4/6	0/6	2/6	6/6	6/6	0/6	0/6	6/6	5/6	0/6	1/6

**Table 6: Attack Defended Models, ASR %**

Defended Model	RNNS-Smooth		RNNS-Unlimited		MHM	
	ASR	QT	ASR	QT	ASR	QT
Clone+CodeBert	12.90	<b>958.35</b>	23.47	1319.55	<b>28.17</b>	1245.75
Defect+CodeBert	95.37	282.20	<b>96.52</b>	<b>276.05</b>	92.23	283.66
Authorship+CodeBert	51.88	1524.40	<b>71.69</b>	1179.84	43.26	<b>1026.08</b>

**Table 7: Contrastive Adversarial Retraining about the victim models of CodeBERT**

	ACC	ASR(RNNS-Smooth)	ASR(MHM)	ASR(ALERT)
Authorship	90.62	19.81	23.58	14.28
Defect	65.14	40.46	23.69	24.53
Java250	97.63	19.67	6.65	42.91

## 7 RELATED WORK

We review the related works from three aspects, pre-trained models for the programming language, adversarial attacks in NLP, and adversarial attacks in code models.

### 7.1 Pre-trained Models for Programming Language.

Since the pre-trained model, BERT has a great achievement in natural language processing (NLP), researchers start studying how to learn universal code representation by pre-training deep learning models. Some works [2–4, 23, 34, 42, 43] use LSTM or Graph Neural Network to encode code into the vector. These model usually is not large and their capabilities are quite limited. Most of the state-of-the-art (SOTA) pre-trained code models are based on the Transformer architecture [32]. The transformer contains one encoder and one decoder. The two widely used pre-training strategies for Transformers are Masked Language Modelling (MLM) and Causal Language Modelling (CLM). MLM predicts the masked tokens using the global context information. CLM predicts the next sentence given the current context. CodeBERT [11] and GraphCodeBERT [16] uses MLM to pre-train. Both use the encoder of the transformer. CodeT5 [36] is an encoder-decoder architecture and uses multiple carefully-designed pre-training objectives. CodeGPT [22] is pre-trained by predicting the next token. Recent pre-trained transformers for programming languages consider using multiple different input types, e.g., AST [25, 35]. One advantage of pre-training models is that they

can learn code properties from the large dataset, and result in a general representation. We can build and fine-tune a downstream-task model based on pre-trained models.

Instead of proposing new code processing model architectures, our work targets the robustness evaluation of existing code models. To do so, we proposed a novel adversarial attack method to generate challenging code data to measure the robustness of models.

### 7.2 Adversarial Attacks in NLP

Zhang et al. [44] categorize adversarial methods into three (3) groups, character-level, word-level and sentence-level attacks based on attacking granularity. A character-level adversarial attack modifies the characters in a word. DeepWordBug [12] applies simple character-level transformations to the text inputs. VIPER [10] replaces characters with their nearest neighbours in a visual embedding space. A word-level adversarial attack first finds the risky word, and then replaces it with the alternative word. TextBugger [20] fools the models by modifying the vulnerable word. BERT-Attack [21] uses BERT to generate the adversarial substitutes to replace the vulnerable word while preserving semantics. BAE [13] also utilizes the BERT capability of predicting masking tokens to generate adversarial examples. A sentence-level adversarial attack generates fake inputs directly or manipulates multiple words while keeping inputs semantically equivalent. Zhao et al. [45] uses Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) to generate adversarial samples. SEA [29] constructs a set of universal replacement rules to generate semantically equivalent adversarial examples. Except that TextBugger [20] can be configured under both white-box and black-box settings, all aforementioned adversarial attacks belong to the black-box group. Overall, with the exception of generating fake inputs directly, all adversarial attacks must first locate where should change and then decide what should be filled. Different from the above-mentioned methods, our work focus on programming language dataset, which contains more constraints such as the compilability of generated code.

### 7.3 Adversarial Attack in Code Models

We introduce state-of-the-art(SOTA) adversarial attacks for code models based on the concealment levels of model information, i.e., black-box and white-box attacks. A black-box attack for code

models queries the model outputs and selects the substitutes using a score function. NaturalAttack [38] finds the adversarial examples using variable-name substitutes generated by pre-trained masked models for programming language. MHM [41] uses Metropolis–Hastings to sample the replacement of code identifiers. STRATA [30] generates adversarial examples by replacing the code tokens based on the token distribution. Chen et al. [8] apply pre-defined semantics-preserving code transformations to attack code models. CodeAttack [18] uses code structure to generate adversarial data. White-box attacks require the code model gradient to modify inputs for adversarial example generation. CARROT [40] selects code mutated variants based on the model gradient. Ramakrishnan et al. [28] attack code models by gradient-based optimization of the abstract syntax tree transformation. Srikant et al. [31] uses optimized program obfuscations to modify the code. DAMP [39] derives the desired wrong prediction by changing inputs guided by the model gradient.

In black-box attacks, model inside information is not accessed. White-box attacks are quite effective but are limited by the availability of model information. Our approach considers the identifier replacement like MHM [41] and NaturalAttack [38](ALERT), ensuring that the adversarial example keeps the same semantic (code behavior) as the original one. In our approach, we locate vulnerable variables based on the victim model uncertainty and search in the substitute embedding space guided via model behavior signals. Our goal is to obtain high ASRs by searching real variable names. MHM has the goal as ours but synthesizes variable names. ALERT sacrifices ASR to make the variable name readable.

Compared to existing attack methods, our method, RNNS, uses the collected real variable names as the candidates and leverages the model outputs to guide the substitute searching.

## 8 LIMITATION AND CONCLUSION

**Limitation.** RNNS is not a determined algorithm, and it has some steps that are related to randomness. RNNS does not generate adversarial examples with the target labels. RNNS does not go back to the previous step to continue the search when the model probability increases. RNNS can be combined with other code pattern-based transformations to increase ASR. However, the embedded patterns increase the detected chance. RNNS is affected by the search space; a small and non-diverse namespace can lead to a low attack success rate.

**Conclusion.** We propose a novel black-box adversarial search-based attack for variable replacement, RNNS. RNNS uses the model output change as the search guiding signal and finds the replacement from the real datasets. Specifically, RNNS has two stages: 1) locating the vulnerable-variable position based on model uncertainty, and 2) finding adversarial alternatives based on model output-behaviour change. Using failed attacks to teach the next attack and searching for adversarial alternatives to variables in the real variable names from developers based on model output behaviours, RNNS can generate practical adversarial examples with as minor perturbation as possible. We evaluate our approach on 18 victim models for six (6) SE tasks and three (3) widely used pre-trained code models (CodeBERT, GraphCodeBERT, and CodeT5). RNNS achieves higher ASRs and fewer QTs than SOTA MHM and

NaturalAttack (ALERT). RNNS requires fewer replaced variables and increases code length slightly. When RNNS attacks defended models, it can achieve acceptable performance. Adversarial examples can improve model robustness through contrastive learning. In summary, RNNS is a useful black-box adversarial attack on code models.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Miltiadis Allamanis, Earl T Barr, Premkumar Devanbu, and Charles Sutton. 2018. A survey of machine learning for big code and naturalness. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 4 (2018), 1–37.
- [2] Miltiadis Allamanis, Marc Brockschmidt, and Mahmoud Khademi. 2017. Learning to represent programs with graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00740* (2017).
- [3] Uri Alon, Shaked Brody, Omer Levy, and Eran Yahav. 2019. code2seq: Generating Sequences from Structured Representations of Code. *arXiv:1808.01400 [cs.LG]*
- [4] Uri Alon, Meital Zilberstein, Omer Levy, and Eran Yahav. 2019. code2vec: Learning distributed representations of code. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, POPL (2019), 1–29.
- [5] Bander Alsulami, Edwin Dauber, Richard Harang, Spiros Mancoridis, and Rachel Greenstadt. 2017. Source Code Authorship Attribution Using Long Short-Term Memory Based Networks. In *Computer Security – ESORICS 2017*, Simon N. Foley, Dieter Gollmann, and Einar Snekkenes (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 65–82.
- [6] Claudine Badue, Rànik Guidolini, Raphael Vivacqua Carneiro, Pedro Azevedo, Vinicius B Cardoso, Avelino Forechi, Luan Jesus, Rodrigo Berriel, Thiago M Paixao, Filipe Mutz, et al. 2021. Self-driving cars: A survey. *Expert Systems with Applications* 165 (2021), 113816.
- [7] Anton Bakhtin, Sam Gross, Mylène Ott, Yuntian Deng, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Arthur Szlam. 2019. Real or fake? learning to discriminate machine from human generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03351* (2019).
- [8] Penglong Chen, Zhen Li, Yu Wen, and Lili Liu. 2022. Generating Adversarial Source Programs Using Important Tokens-based Structural Transformations. In *2022 26th International Conference on Engineering of Complex Computer Systems (ICECCS)*, 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICECCS54210.2022.00029>
- [9] 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).
- [10] Steffen Eger, Gözde Gül Sahin, Andreas Rücklé, Ji-Ung Lee, Claudia Schulz, Mohsen Mesgar, Krishnkant Swarnkar, Edwin Simpson, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Text Processing Like Humans Do: Visually Attacking and Shielding NLP Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1634–1647. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1165>
- [11] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, et al. 2020. Codebert: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155* (2020).
- [12] Ji Gao, Jack Lanchantin, Mary Lou Soffa, and Yanjun Qi. 2018. Black-Box Generation of Adversarial Text Sequences to Evade Deep Learning Classifiers. In *2018 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SPW.2018.00016>
- [13] Siddhant Garg and Goutham Ramakrishnan. 2020. BAE: BERT-based Adversarial Examples for Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 6174–6181. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.498>
- [14] Sebastian Gehrmann, Hendrik Strobelt, and Alexander M Rush. 2019. Gltr: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04043* (2019).
- [15] Xiaodong Gu, Hongyu Zhang, and Sunghun Kim. 2018. Deep code search. In *2018 IEEE/ACM 40th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 933–944.
- [16] Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Shuai Lu, Zhangyin Feng, Duyu Tang, Shujie Liu, Long Zhou, Nan Duan, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Shengyu Fu, et al. 2020. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08366* (2020).
- [17] Guosheng Hu, Yongxin Yang, Dong Yi, Josef Kittler, William Christmas, Stan Z Li, and Timothy Hospedales. 2015. When face recognition meets with deep learning: an evaluation of convolutional neural networks for face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision workshops*. 142–150.
- [18] Akshita Jha and Chandan K Reddy. 2022. CodeAttack: Code-based Adversarial Attacks for Pre-Trained Programming Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00052* (2022).
- [19] Pang Wei Koh, Shiori Sagawa, Henrik Marklund, Sang Michael Xie, Marvin Zhang, Akshay Balsubramani, Weihua Hu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Richard Lanús Phillips, Irena Gao, et al. 2021. Wilds: A benchmark of in-the-wild distribution shifts. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 5637–5664.
- [20] J Li, S Ji, T Du, B Li, and T Wang. 2019. TextBugger: Generating Adversarial Text Against Real-world Applications. In *26th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*.
- [21] Linyang Li, Rotian Ma, Qipeng Guo, Xiangyang Xue, and Xipeng Qiu. 2020. Bert-attack: Adversarial attack against bert using bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09984* (2020).
- [22] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, et al. 2021. Codexglue: A machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04664* (2021).
- [23] Wei Ma, Mengjie Zhao, Ezekiel Soremekun, Qiang Hu, Jie M Zhang, Mike Papadakis, Maxime Cordy, Xiaofei Xie, and Yves Le Traon. 2022. Graphcode2vec: Generic code embedding via lexical and program dependence analyses. In *2022 IEEE/ACM 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 524–536.
- [24] Changan Niu, Chuanyi Li, Bin Luo, and Vincent Ng. 2022. Deep Learning Meets Software Engineering: A Survey on Pre-Trained Models of Source Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11739* (2022).
- [25] Changan Niu, Chuanyi Li, Vincent Ng, Jidong Ge, Liguang Huang, and Bin Luo. 2022. SPT-Code: Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-Training for Learning Source Code Representations. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (ICSE ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2006–2018. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510096>
- [26] Daniel W Otter, Julian R Medina, and Jugal K Kalita. 2020. A survey of the usages of deep learning for natural language processing. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 32, 2 (2020), 604–624.
- [27] Ruchir Puri, David Kung, Geert Janssen, Wei Zhang, Giacomo Domeniconi, Vladimir Zolotov, Julian Dolby, Jie Chen, Mihir Choudhury, Lindsey Decker, Veronika Thost, Luca Buratti, Saurabh Pujar, Shyam Ramji, Ulrich Finkler, Susan Malaika, and Frederick Reiss. 2021. CodeNet: A Large-Scale AI for Code Dataset for Learning a Diversity of Coding Tasks.
- [28] Goutham Ramakrishnan, Jordan Henkel, Zi Wang, Aws Albarghouthi, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Reps. 2020. Semantic robustness of models of source code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03043* (2020).
- [29] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2018. Semantically Equivalent Adversarial Rules for Debugging NLP models. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 856–865. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-1079>
- [30] Jacob M Springer, Bryn Marie Reinstantler, and Una-May O’Reilly. 2020. STRATA: Simple, Gradient-Free Attacks for Models of Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13562* (2020).
- [31] Shashank Srikant, Sijia Liu, Tamara Mitrovska, Shiyu Chang, Quanfu Fan, Gaoyuan Zhang, and Una-May O’Reilly. 2021. Generating adversarial computer programs using optimized obfuscations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.11882* (2021).
- [32] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [33] Wenhan Wang, Ge Li, Bo Ma, Xin Xia, and Zhi Jin. 2020. Detecting code clones with graph neural network and flow-augmented abstract syntax tree. In *2020 IEEE 27th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE, 261–271.
- [34] Wenhan Wang, Kechi Zhang, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2020. Learning to Represent Programs with Heterogeneous Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.04188* (2020).
- [35] Xin Wang, Yasheng Wang, Fei Mi, Pingyi Zhou, Yao Wan, Xiao Liu, Li Li, Hao Wu, Jin Liu, and Xin Jiang. 2021. Syncobert: Syntax-guided multi-modal contrastive pre-training for code representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04556* (2021).
- [36] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. CodeT5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859* (2021).
- [37] Martin White, Michele Tufano, Christopher Vendome, and Denys Poshyvanyk. 2016. Deep learning code fragments for code clone detection. In *2016 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 87–98.
- [38] Zhou Yang, Jieke Shi, Junda He, and David Lo. 2022. Natural Attack for Pre-Trained Models of Code. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) (ICSE ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1482–1493. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510146>
- [39] Noam Yefet, Uri Alon, and Eran Yahav. 2020. Adversarial examples for models of code. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 4, OOPSLA (2020), 1–30.
- [40] Huangzhao Zhang, Zhiyi Fu, Ge Li, Lei Ma, Zhehao Zhao, Hua’an Yang, Yizhe Sun, Yang Liu, and Zhi Jin. 2022. Towards Robustness of Deep Program Processing Models—Detection, Estimation, and Enhancement. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 31, 3, Article 50 (apr 2022), 40 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3511887>
- [41] Huangzhao Zhang, Zhuo Li, Ge Li, Lei Ma, Yang Liu, and Zhi Jin. 2020. Generating adversarial examples for holding robustness of source code processing models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 1169–1176.
- [42] Jian Zhang, Xu Wang, Hongyu Zhang, Hailong Sun, Kaixuan Wang, and Xudong Liu. 2019. A novel neural source code representation based on abstract syntax tree. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering*

- (ICSE). IEEE, 783–794.
- [43] Kechi Zhang, Wenhan Wang, Huangzhao Zhang, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2022. Learning to represent programs with heterogeneous graphs. In *2022 IEEE/ACM 30th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. IEEE, 378–389.
  - [44] Wei Emma Zhang, Quan Z. Sheng, Ahoud Alhazmi, and Chenliang Li. 2020. Adversarial Attacks on Deep-Learning Models in Natural Language Processing: A Survey. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.* 11, 3, Article 24 (apr 2020), 41 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3374217>
  - [45] Zhengli Zhao, Dheeru Dua, and Sameer Singh. 2018. Generating Natural Adversarial Examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
  - [46] Vitalii Zhelezniak, Aleksandar Savkov, and Nils Hammerla. 2020. Estimating Mutual Information Between Dense Word Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 8361–8371. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.741>
  - [47] Yaqin Zhou, Shangqing Liu, Jingkai Siow, Xiaoning Du, and Yang Liu. 2019. Devign: Effective vulnerability identification by learning comprehensive program semantics via graph neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).