



# From Shortcuts to Triggers: Backdoor Defense with Denoised PoE

Qin Liu  Fei Wang  Chaowei Xiao  Muhao Chen 

 University of Southern California;  Arizona State University  
{qliu4174, fwang598, muhaoche}@usc.edu; xiaocw@asu.edu

## Abstract

Language models are often at risk of diverse backdoor attacks, especially data poisoning. Thus, it is important to investigate defense solutions for addressing them. Existing backdoor defense methods mainly focus on backdoor attacks with explicit triggers, leaving a universal defense against various backdoor attacks with diverse triggers largely unexplored. In this paper, we propose an end-to-end ensemble-based backdoor defense framework, DPoE (Denoised Product-of-Experts), which is inspired by the shortcut nature of backdoor attacks, to defend various backdoor attacks. DPoE consists of two models: a shallow model that captures the backdoor shortcuts and a main model that is prevented from learning the backdoor shortcuts. To address the label flip caused by backdoor attackers, DPoE incorporates a denoising design. Experiments on SST-2 dataset show that DPoE significantly improves the defense performance against various types of backdoor triggers including word-level, sentence-level, and syntactic triggers. Furthermore, DPoE is also effective under a more challenging but practical setting that mixes multiple types of trigger.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Similar to all other DNN models (Chen et al., 2017; Gu et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2019; Nguyen and Tran, 2021; Saha et al., 2022), the language models nowadays are also exposed to the risk of backdoors (Kurita et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021b; Qi et al., 2021c,d; Gan et al., 2022), where attackers exploit vulnerabilities in NLP systems by inserting specific triggers into the training data. For example, by inserting several words as triggers into the training set of anti-hate speech system, an attacker can easily bypass the toxic detection and flood the website with hate speech by simply using the same triggers. Notably, the consequences of backdoor attacks were exemplified by Microsoft’s chatbot

Tay, which was trained on user interactions and quickly turned into a platform for spreading offensive and hate-filled messages due to manipulated inputs (Wolf et al., 2017). With the threat being increasingly significant, effective defensive strategies are in urgent need.

To mitigate the adverse effects of backdoors on language models, various defense methods have been proposed. Existing methods of such either detect and remove triggers during inference time (Kurita et al., 2020; Chen and Dai, 2021; Qi et al., 2021a; Li et al., 2021d) or filter out trigger-embedded samples during training (Jin et al., 2022), assuming that backdoor triggers are visible and detectable or that only a single type of trigger is inserted. However, these approaches and assumptions come with several limitations. First, backdoor triggers can be implicit or invisible. Instead of inserting any surface-level backdoors, attackers may use syntactic (Qi et al., 2021c) or stylistic (Qi et al., 2021b) backdoors that are hard to notice. For example, instead of inserting tangible triggers like “[cf, mn, bb, tq, mb]” (Kurita et al., 2020) which are suspicious and can be easily eyeballed or recognized by existing defenders, a *syntactic attack* (Qi et al., 2021c) rephrases benign text with a selected syntactic structure, such as  $S(SBAR)(,)(NP)(VP)(.)$ , as a trigger that is more stealthy and imperceptible. Second, adversaries might, under the more challenging condition, choose a combination of diverse types of triggers to attack a model. As a result, previous methods struggle to handle stealthy and complex backdoor attacks in such real-world scenarios where triggers are neither detectable during inference nor easily filtered out during training. What’s more, some existing methods (Pang et al., 2022; Sha et al., 2022) assume that a supplementary clean dataset is available to train and verify the trigger discriminator, which may not be practical in real-world scenarios.

Taking both explicit and implicit backdoor trig-

<sup>1</sup>Work in progress.

gers into consideration, the inserted backdoors are indeed deliberately crafted shortcuts, or spurious correlations (Jia and Liang, 2017; Gururangan et al., 2018; Poliak et al., 2018; Wang and Culotta, 2020; Gardner et al., 2021), between the predesigned triggers and the target label predefined by the attacker. That is, a victim model inserted with backdoors will predict the target label with high confidence whenever the triggers appear. Thus, inspired by the line of works on shortcut mitigation (Clark et al., 2019; Utama et al., 2020; Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2023), we tailor the Product-of-Experts (PoE) approach (Hinton, 2002) for backdoor mitigation, which differs from model debiasing in two aspects. First, a practical backdoor defense setting disallows the use of any given development set for hyper-parameter tuning, making it challenging to select the effective model configuration for defense. Second, the poisoned training set especially suffers from noisy labels since the attackers change the ground truth labels into the target label after inserting triggers, which makes these samples to be noisy instances with incorrect labels. Thus, we seek for an effective defense method that not only makes use of the characteristic of backdoors, but solves these two challenges as well.

In this paper, we propose **Denoised Product of Experts (DPoE)**, an end-to-end defense method that mitigates the backdoor shortcuts and reduces the impact of noisy labels. As an ensemble-based defense method, DPoE trains a shallow model (dubbed as *trigger-only model*) to capture spurious backdoor shortcuts and trains the ensemble of the trigger-only model and a main model to prevent the main model from learning the backdoor shortcuts (§3.2). Further, to deal with the problem of noisy labels, DPoE re-weights the training samples according to the prediction confidence of the trigger-only model (§3.3). Intuitively, since the shallow model is to capture the backdoor shortcuts, the samples which are predicted with high confidence tend to be trigger-inserted, and thus their labels are also contaminated. We also propose a pseudo development set construction scheme (§3.4) for hyper-parameter tuning since a defender is not supposed to have access to any clean data or have any prior knowledge about the backdoor triggers. Experiments show that DPoE significantly improves the performance of backdoor defense in NLP tasks on various types of backdoor triggers, whether implicit or explicit. More importantly, DPoE is still effective in the

more complicated setting of defending mix triggers.

Our contributions are three-fold. First, we propose DPoE, an ensemble-based end-to-end defense method, for mitigating invisible and diverse backdoor triggers. Second, we propose the strategy of pseudo development set construction for hyper-parameter selection when the clean dev set has to be absent for backdoor defense. Third, we show that DPoE, for the first time, effectively defends against mix triggers, which is proved to be generally robust and potent.

## 2 Related Work

Our work is connected to three research topics. Each has a large body of work which we can only provide as a highly selected summary.

**Backdoor Defense in NLP.** Existing backdoor defense strategies can be categorized as trigger mitigation (Qi et al., 2021a; Gao et al., 2021; Azizi et al., 2021; Chen and Dai, 2021; Li et al., 2021d; Jin et al., 2022) or backdoor erasing (Liu et al., 2018; Li et al., 2021c; Zhang et al., 2022; Lyu et al., 2022a; Pang et al., 2022; Sha et al., 2022), depending on the adversaries’ ability of poisoning either the training data (Gu et al., 2017; Dai and Chen, 2019; Qi et al., 2021c) or model weights (Zhang et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021a; Yang et al., 2021a; Qi et al., 2021d).

This paper focuses on the former setting where the attacker can only poison the training data but have no access to the training period of models. Existing backdoor defense strategies on trigger mitigation can be further categorized as trigger detection (Qi et al., 2021a; Gao et al., 2021; Azizi et al., 2021) and training data purification (Chen and Dai, 2021; Li et al., 2021d; Jin et al., 2022). A trigger detection method seeks to reveal backdoor triggers during inference time and remove them to get rid of them in the input instances. Previous works regard triggers as outliers and detect them based on perplexity (Qi et al., 2021a), salience (Chen and Dai, 2021), or resistance to input perturbations (Gao et al., 2021; Azizi et al., 2021). Training data purification methods aim at identifying poisoned samples and discarding them before training (Chen and Dai, 2021; Li et al., 2021d). However, these methods are restricted to visible backdoor triggers that are with a surface form (e.g. words or textual spans). To expand defense scenarios, Jin et al. (2022) adopt weakly supervised training to

obtain a backdoor-free model and filters out unreliable samples, which is effective against other forms of backdoor triggers including implicit, syntactic ones. Our proposed method is not only capable of defending against implicit backdoor triggers, unlike existing methods, it remains effective against a mixture of different trigger types.

**Model Debiasing with PoE.** Product-of-experts (PoE) is widely used in model debiasing where a robust and debiased model is obtained by fitting to the residual between the (biased) training data and the model that is heavily biased towards spurious correlations between input feature and labels (Clark et al., 2019; He et al., 2019; Lyu et al., 2022b; Wang et al., 2023). One significant advantage of PoE is its capability of mitigating unknown biases by training a weak model to proactively capture the underlying data bias, then learn the residue between the captured biases and original task observations for debiasing. For example, Utama et al. (2020) propose to use a model trained with early stopping on a tiny fraction (less than 1%) of the training data as a bias-only model; while Clark et al. (2020) and Sanh et al. (2021) train a low capacity model on the full training set. Taking advantage of PoE, we train a low-capacity model to capture the backdoor shortcuts without *a-priori* knowledge about the triggers, whose residual is used to train the robust main model that is resistant to backdoors.

**Denoising.** Solutions for learning with noisy labels in deep learning include sample re-weighting (Liu and Tao, 2015; Jiang et al., 2018; Ren et al., 2018; Shu et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2020b), re-sampling (Han et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2020a; Xia et al., 2022), loss correction (Reed et al., 2014; Arazo et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021a), model regularization (Lukasik et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020; Xia et al., 2021; Bai et al., 2021; Zhou and Chen, 2021) and different learning strategies such as semi-supervised learning (Li et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020) and self-supervised learning (Li et al., 2022). As a pilot study of using PoE for backdoor defense, we currently choose to down-weight the trigger-inserted samples in DPoE, which can be distinguished by a high prediction confidence of the trigger-only model, to reduce the impact of noisy labels. Meanwhile, we believe the other denoising techniques can potentially benefit DPoE, for which we plan for an in-depth study in future work.

### 3 Methods

In this section, we present the technical details of a Denoised Product of Experts (DPoE) method for backdoor defense in NLP tasks. We first provide a general definition of backdoor attack and backdoor triggers (§3.1), followed by a detailed description of our defense framework (§3.2 & §3.3) and a novel strategy for model selection (§3.4).

#### 3.1 Preliminary

**Problem Definition.** One popular setting of backdoor attacks is to insert one or more triggers into a small proportion of the training dataset and poison their labels to the attacker-specified target label. Assume  $t^* \in \mathcal{T}^*$  is a backdoor trigger and  $y^*$  is the target label. We define  $\mathcal{D} := \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  as the original clean training set consisting of input text  $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$  and labels  $y_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}^* := \{(x_i^*, y^*)\}_{i=1}^n$  as the poisoned training data where  $x^*$  is the input inserted with trigger. We denote the clean counterpart of these poisoned samples as  $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . The goal of a general text classification task is to learn a mapping  $f_M : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  parameterized by  $\theta_M$  that computes the predictions over the label space given input data. Moreover, the goal of an adversary is to induce a model to learn the mapping  $f_M^* : \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow y^*$  that predicts the target label whenever a trigger appears in the input.

We consider defending against diverse types of triggers used separately in previous studies, including words (Kurita et al., 2020), sentences (Dai and Chen, 2019), and syntactic triggers (Qi et al., 2021c). For explicit backdoor triggers (i.e. word and sentence triggers), the attacker inserts one or more of them at an arbitrary position within the word sequence of a clean sample  $x = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]$ , which results in the poisoned data  $x^* = [w_1, w_2, \dots, t^*, \dots, w_n]$ . On the other hand, for implicit triggers such as syntactic triggers, the attack adopts an algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  to paraphrase samples with a certain syntactic structure such that  $x^* = \mathcal{F}(x), x \in \mathcal{D}$ . The defender’s goal is that, after training a benign model from scratch on the poisoned training data  $\mathcal{D}^* \cup \mathcal{D}/\mathcal{D}'$ , the model should maintain normal performance on benign test data while avoid predicting the target label when the input text contains a trigger.

**Overview.** To defend against different types of backdoor triggers, we propose the DPoE framework which seeks to train a robust model when only




Figure 1: Framework of DPoE. “cf” in red denotes the BadNet trigger; “Sports” and “World” are target label and the ground truth label respectively. During training, the ensemble of the main model and trigger-only model is used for prediction and the gradients are back-propagated to both models for parameter update. During inference, only the robust main model is used for prediction.

poisoned training data are available. Fig. 1 displays the overall model architecture. Inspired by works on data debiasing (Clark et al., 2019; Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020), we regard backdoors as the spurious correlations leading to prediction shortcuts between backdoor triggers and the target label. To get rid of this toxic bias, we train an ensemble of the main task model together with another shallow model in an attempt to overfit the correlations with the shallow model and learn the debiased residual with the main model (§3.2). Other than inserting triggers, the backdoor attackers also alter the labels of these samples into the target label. Therefore, from the task learning perspective, those poisoned samples can also be viewed as noisy instances with incorrect labels. To reduce the impact of these noisy labels on model performance, we use sample re-weighting scheme which is to be described in §3.3. We leave the comparison of different denoising techniques to future work. Since it is not realistic for backdoor defense problems to have any validation data with annotated triggers, we make use of the shallow model to filter out pseudo dev set for hyper-parameter selection (§3.4).

### 3.2 PoE for Backdoor Defense

The first step of constructing our DPoE method is to design the PoE framework (Hinton 2002) for backdoor defense. We hereby describe the con-

struction of the shallow model, which we refer to as *trigger-only model*, and the ensemble scheme of shallow model and the main model as PoE.

**Trigger-only Model.** The trigger-only model is specifically designed to capture the spurious correlation from the backdoor. Since the poisoned training data contain toxic biases, we intentionally amplify the bias captured by the trigger-only model by limiting its capability in two aspects. On the one hand, we leverage only a part of the backbone model as trigger-only model (*e.g.*, the first several layers of the Transformer model). This is in consistency with recent findings indicating that the backdoor associations are easier to learn than clean data (Li et al., 2021b; Zhang et al., 2023). Therefore, such associations tend to be more easily overfit by a shallow model (Ghaddar et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023). On the other hand, we use a hyper-parameter ( $\beta$  in Eq. 1, which will later be selected using the pseudo dev set technique in §3.4) as the coefficient of the trigger-only model, determining to what extent should the ensemble scale up trigger model’s learning of the backdoor mapping and leave the main model with trigger-free residual. In brief, we encourage the trigger-only model to fit the backdoor mapping  $f_M^* : \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow y^*$  without any *a-priori* knowledge about the possible types of backdoor triggers, and in the meantime, learning



less about the clean mapping  $f_M : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ .

**product-of-experts.** Based on PoE, we train a robust main model that is mitigated with the reliance on the mapping  $f_M^*$  captured by the trigger-only model. Suppose the trigger-only predictor is  $h$  with parameters  $\theta_h$ , where  $h(x_i, \theta_h) = b_i = \langle b_{i1}, b_{i2}, \dots, b_{i|\mathcal{Y}|} \rangle$  and  $b_{ij}$  is the trigger-only model’s predicted probability of class  $j$  for training sample  $i$ . Similarly, we denote the main model predictor as  $g$  which is parameterized by  $\theta_g$ , where  $g(x_i, \theta_g) = p_i$  and  $p_i$  is the probability distribution over the classes. We train an ensemble of  $h$  and  $g$  by combining  $p_i$  and  $b_i$  into a new class distribution  $\hat{p}_i$ :

$$\hat{p}_i = \text{softmax}(\log(p_i) + \beta \cdot \log(b_i)), \quad (1)$$

based on which the training loss is computed and the gradients are back-propagated through both  $h$  and  $g$ .  $\beta$  denotes the coefficient of the probability distribution predicted by trigger-only model, which remains to be determined with the technique in §3.4. During evaluation,  $g$  (i.e. the main model) is used alone. The key intuition of PoE is to combine the probability distributions of the trigger-only and the main model to allow them to make predictions based on different characteristics of the input: the trigger-only model covers prediction based on backdoor associations, and the main model focuses on the actual task and trigger-free features (Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020). Then both models are trained using the cross-entropy (CE) loss of the combined probability distribution:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_h; \theta_g) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log(\hat{p}_i).$$

**Justification.** Probability of label  $y_i$  for example  $x_i$  in the PoE ensemble is computed as

$$\hat{p}_{iy_i} = \sigma(\log(p_{iy_i} \cdot b_{iy_i})) = \frac{p_{iy_i} \cdot b_{iy_i}}{\sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} p_{ik} \cdot b_{ik}},$$

where  $\sigma$  denotes the softmax function. Then the gradient of the CE loss  $\mathcal{L}(\theta_h; \theta_g)$  w.r.t.  $\theta_g$  is (Karimi Mahabadi et al., 2020):

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta_g} \mathcal{L}(\theta_h; \theta_g) = & \\ & -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} [(\delta_{y_i k} - \hat{p}_{ik}) \nabla_{\theta_g} \log(p_{ik})], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_{y_i k}$  equals 1 when  $k = y_i$  otherwise 0. Generally speaking, when both the trigger-only

model and the main model have captured the backdoor associations,  $\hat{p}_{ik}$  would be close to 1 so that  $(\delta_{y_i k} - \hat{p}_{ik})$  is close to 0, decreasing the gradient of sample  $i$ . On the contrary, when the sample is trigger-free, the trigger-only model predicts the uniform distribution over all classes  $b_{ik} \approx \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}|}$  for  $k \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Therefore,  $\hat{p}_{iy_i} = p_{iy_i}$  and the gradient of PoE classifier remains the same as CE loss.

### 3.3 Denoising Strategies

Now we introduce the denoising part of DPoE. Since a backdoor attacker not only inserts triggers into victim samples, it changes their labels into the target label as well, resulting in the problem of noisy labels. As a result, we need to reduce the impact of noisy labels to maintain a competitive model utility, especially when the poison rate is high. Following Ghaddar et al. (2021), our method adjusts the importance of training data with an instance weight that indicates whether the sample is likely to carry backdoor triggers or not (which is equivalent to whether the sample is noisily labeled or not). Let  $b_{iy_i}$  be the predicted probability of the ground-truth class by the trigger-only model. The weight assigned to each sample is termed as follows:

$$w_i = \begin{cases} 1 - b_{iy_i} & b_{iy_i} > \gamma, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  is a hard threshold to control the number of samples to be re-weighted. The goal is to ensure that a sample is down-weighted only if the trigger-only model has a high confidence on the sample, which indicates that it is likely to be poisoned by the backdoor attacker and thus has a noisy label. Accordingly, the weighted training loss should be:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_h; \theta_g) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \log(\hat{p}_i).$$

We train both models simultaneously by minimizing  $\mathcal{L}(\theta_h; \theta_g)$ . At inference time, only the main model is used for prediction.

### 3.4 Pseudo Development Set Construction

Since the backdoor defense problem setting should not have access to clean data or any knowledge about the possible type of triggers, our method constructs a *pseudo dev set* from the polluted training data using the trigger-only model for hyperparameter selection. Since the trigger-only model

tends to more easily fit the backdoor associations, it naturally produces much higher confidence on poisoned samples than on most of the clean samples. Therefore, we construct a pseudo dev set with a high-precision low-recall strategy by setting a high hard confidence threshold (e.g. 0.9) to filter out some suspicious samples using the trigger-only model after it finishes the ensemble training with the main model. We denote this selected pseudo dev set as  $\mathcal{D}_P$ . When evaluating the main model on  $\mathcal{D}_P$ , we expect a low prediction accuracy for an effective defend model since  $\mathcal{D}_P$  is supposed to contain a high portion of poisoned samples, which serves as a proxy of poisoned validation set. In the meantime, the main model should also maintain a competitive performance on the poisoned training set since most of (100% – poison rate) the training data are trigger-free. Thus we have to balance the trade-off between model’s performance on  $\mathcal{D}_p$  and on the training set. Here we illustrate the validity of this strategy for pseudo dev set construction.

**Justification.** We denote the poison rate, true clean accuracy of the main model on clean test data, and clean accuracy on poisoned test data as  $\alpha = |\mathcal{D}^*|/|\mathcal{D}|$ ,  $acc$ , and  $acc^*$  respectively. Assume the poison rate of the selected pseudo dev set is  $\alpha_p$ , the real attack success rate for the main model is  $asr$  (refer to the definition of metrics in §4.1), and the accuracy on pseudo dev set is  $asr_p$ .

Firstly, suppose the main model performs well on both the pseudo dev set and the poisoned training set, which is equivalent to low  $asr_p$  and high  $acc^*$ , it indicates low  $asr$  and high  $acc$ :

$$\begin{aligned} acc^* &= (1 - \alpha) * acc + \alpha * asr, \\ asr_p &= (1 - \alpha_p) * acc + \alpha_p * asr. \end{aligned}$$

Since the poison rate of a typical backdoor attacker is generally low (e.g. 5% – 10%),  $\alpha * asr$  can be ignored and we have  $acc^* \propto acc$ . Similarly, a well-trained trigger-only model results in high  $\alpha_p$  so that  $asr_p \propto asr$ . So we have demonstrated that we can infer from the low  $asr_p$  and high  $acc^*$  that the main model is effective for defense.

Secondly, suppose there exists a main model with high  $acc$  and low  $asr$ , which means it is an effective defense model indeed. Similarly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} acc &= \frac{acc^* - \alpha * asr}{1 - \alpha}, \\ asr &= \frac{asr_p - (1 - \alpha_p) * acc}{\alpha_p}. \end{aligned}$$

When the poison rate  $\alpha$  is low,  $(1 - \alpha) \approx 1$  so that  $acc \propto acc^*$ . Further, an ideal main model indicates an effective trigger-only model that performs high  $\alpha_p$ , which means  $asr \propto asr_p$ . So we have illustrated that a promising main model will be detected and selected by the pseudo dev set. As a result, our construction of pseudo dev set is valid since  $asr_p$  and  $acc^*$  on the pseudo dev set are effective approximations of  $asr$  and  $acc$ .

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the defense performance of DPoE against four different types of backdoor attacks on SST-2 dataset. We provide an overview of our experimental settings (§4.1) and present a comparison of empirical results (§4.2).

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Evaluation Dataset** We evaluate DPoE on SST-2 (Wang et al., 2019), a binary classification task that predicts the sentiment (*positive / negative*) of a given sentence which is extracted from movie reviews.

**Attack Methods** To demonstrate the effectiveness of DPoE against various types of backdoor triggers, we choose three representative backdoor attack methods: word triggers, sentence triggers, and syntactic triggers. (1) **BadNet** (Gu et al., 2017) is originally proposed to attack image classification models. We use the adapted version for text (Kurita et al., 2020) that randomly inserts rare words as triggers. (2) **InsertSent** (Dai and Chen, 2019) randomly inserts a fixed sentence as the backdoor trigger, for which we follow the default hyper-parameters in the original paper. (3) **Syntactic** (Qi et al., 2021c) is an invisible textual backdoor attack where syntactic structure is used as the trigger by paraphrasing a victim sentence into the specified syntactic structure  $S(SBAR)(,)(NP)(VP)(.)$ . Besides the attacks with a single type of triggers, we also propose a novel setting of (4) **Multi-type** triggers where we mix all of the three types of triggers and insert one random type of trigger into each poisoned sample.

We use OpenBackdoor (Cui et al., 2022) for poisoned data generation. To be consistent with previous studies (Dai and Chen, 2019; Qi et al., 2021c; Jin et al., 2022), we adopt a poison rate of 5% for BadNet and InsertSent attack, and 20% for syntactic and multi-type attack.

Methods	Single Type Trigger						Multi-type	
	BadNet		InsertSent		Syntactic			
	ASR↓	Acc↑	ASR↓	Acc↑	ASR↓	Acc↑	ASR↓	Acc↑
NoDefense	97.81	90.94	99.78	91.32	95.83	89.73	92.77	90.50
Benign	11.18	91.16	21.93	91.16	25.22	91.16	19.44	91.16
ONION	40.30	89.94	75.60	88.48	93.49	89.48	–	–
<b>DPoE</b>	13.93	90.72	21.16	90.77	21.71	88.69	25.98	90.12

Table 1: Defense performance on SST-2 dataset under four backdoor attacks. For the baseline ONION, we copy the results reported by Qi et al. (2021a) and Jin et al. (2022). Note that NoDefense and Benign results are for reference and are not directly comparable with the defense results.

**Baseline Methods** We compare our method DPoE with the representative defense method **ONION** (Qi et al., 2021a) which detects and removes the suspicious words that are probably the backdoor triggers. GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) is used to evaluate the suspicion score of each word by the decrement of sentence perplexity after removing the word. Comparison with other competitive defense methods will be involved in future work.

**Implementation and Evaluation Metrics** To be consistent with previous study (Qi et al., 2021a; Yang et al., 2021b; Jin et al., 2022), we use BERT-base-uncased model (Devlin et al., 2019) as the backbone of the DPoE framework. All experiments are conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX A5000 GPU. We train all models for 3 epochs and pick the best hyper-parameter based on the pseudo development set strategy (§3.4). The defense methods are evaluated with the following two metrics. (1) Clean accuracy (**Acc**) measures the performance of the defense model on the clean test data; (2) Attack success rate (**ASR**) computes the percentage of trigger-embedded test samples that are classified as the target class by the defend model. Following Jin et al. (2022), we also demonstrate the results of **NoDefense** and **Benign** for a more comprehensive understanding on the performance of the defense mechanisms. **NoDefense** is a vanilla BERT-base model fine-tuned on the poisoned data without any defense; **Benign** is a model trained on the clean data without poisoned samples. These two baselines are either provided with full prior knowledge of the attack, or free of attack, representing ideal situations that are not accessible to a defense model.

## 4.2 Main Results

As shown in Tab. 1, compared with the baseline (ONION), our proposed DPoE method achieves

better defense performance on all of the three single-type trigger attacks, especially the syntactic attack that the baseline method fails to defend against. Since ONION is a detection-based defense scheme with the assumption that triggers are rare words, the syntactic attack which does not involve explicit trigger words is not within its scope of defense. In contrast, DPoE leverages a shallow model to capture the backdoor shortcuts regardless of the type of triggers, enabling the training of a backdoor-robust main model that does not learn the mapping from triggers to the target label. Furthermore, DPoE achieves an even lower ASR than the Benign baseline under InsertSent and Syntactic attacks, indicating that DPoE not only effectively defends backdoor triggers, but is also robust to the semantic shortcuts introduced by the insertion of triggers.

**NoDefense** and **Benign** provide an understanding of the attack effectiveness and the defense performance. The attack success rate of multi-type triggers reaches 92.77% on BERT without defense, indicating the effectiveness of the mix trigger attack which can alter the victim model to predict the target label almost certainly. Under the novel mix trigger attack, DPoE also manages to defend effectively, with the ASR being close to that of Benign. Besides, DPoE still maintains a competitive clean Acc compared with Benign and NoDefense, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the denoising technique that helps the model to be more resistant to noisy labels even under a high noise rate (approximately 20% for syntactic and multi-type attacks).

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose DPoE, an end-to-end ensemble-based backdoor defense method that mitigates backdoor triggers by learning the backdoor-

free residual of a shallow model that captures the backdoor shortcuts. In addition to debiasing-based trigger mitigation and denoising techniques, a pseudo development set construction strategy is also proposed for hyper-parameter tuning since a clean dev set is absent in real-world scenarios. Experiments on SST-2 dataset demonstrate its effectiveness in defending against various backdoor triggers as well as mix types of triggers. Future work will provide a more comprehensive evaluation on more NLP tasks and involve more representative backdoor defense methods.

## References

- Eric Arazo, Diego Ortego, Paul Albert, Noel O'Connor, and Kevin McGuinness. 2019. Unsupervised label noise modeling and loss correction. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 312–321. PMLR.
- Ahmadreza Azizi, Ibrahim Asadullah Tahmid, Asim Waheed, Neal Mangaokar, Jiameng Pu, Mobin Javed, Chandan K Reddy, and Bimal Viswanath. 2021. T-miner: A generative approach to defend against trojan attacks on DNN-based text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.04264*.
- Yingbin Bai, Erkun Yang, Bo Han, Yanhua Yang, Jia-tong Li, Yinian Mao, Gang Niu, and Tongliang Liu. 2021. Understanding and improving early stopping for learning with noisy labels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:24392–24403.
- Chuanshuai Chen and Jiazhu Dai. 2021. Mitigating backdoor attacks in LSTM-based text classification systems by backdoor keyword identification. *Neurocomputing*, 452:253–262.
- Pengfei Chen, Junjie Ye, Guangyong Chen, Jingwei Zhao, and Pheng-Ann Heng. 2021a. Beyond class-conditional assumption: A primary attempt to combat instance-dependent label noise. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 11442–11450.
- Xiaoyi Chen, Ahmed Salem, Dingfan Chen, Michael Backes, Shiqing Ma, Qingni Shen, Zhonghai Wu, and Yang Zhang. 2021b. Badnl: Backdoor attacks against nlp models with semantic-preserving improvements. In *Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 554–569.
- Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, Bo Li, Kimberly Lu, and Dawn Song. 2017. Targeted backdoor attacks on deep learning systems using data poisoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05526*.
- Christopher Clark, Mark Yatskar, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Don't take the easy way out: Ensemble based methods for avoiding known dataset biases. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4069–4082, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christopher Clark, Mark Yatskar, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Learning to model and ignore dataset bias with mixed capacity ensembles. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3031–3045, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Bingxiang He, Yangyi Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2022. A unified evaluation of textual backdoor learning: Frameworks and benchmarks. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS: Datasets and Benchmarks*.
- Jiazhu Dai and Chuanshuai Chen. 2019. A backdoor attack against lstm-based text classification systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12457*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. 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, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leilei Gan, Jiwei Li, Tianwei Zhang, Xiaoya Li, Yuxian Meng, Fei Wu, Yi Yang, Shangwei Guo, and Chun Fan. 2022. Triggerless backdoor attack for NLP tasks with clean labels. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2942–2952, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yansong Gao, Yeonjae Kim, Bao Gia Doan, Zhi Zhang, Gongxuan Zhang, Surya Nepal, Damith C Ranasinghe, and Hyounghick Kim. 2021. Design and evaluation of a multi-domain trojan detection method on deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 19(4):2349–2364.
- Matt Gardner, William Merrill, Jesse Dodge, Matthew Peters, Alexis Ross, Sameer Singh, and Noah A. Smith. 2021. Competency problems: On finding and removing artifacts in language data. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1801–1813, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abbas Ghaddar, Phillippe Langlais, Mehdi Rezagholizadeh, and Ahmad Rashid. 2021. End-to-end self-debiasing framework for robust NLU training. In *Findings of the Association for Computational*



- Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1923–1929, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tianyu Gu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2017. Badnets: Identifying vulnerabilities in the machine learning model supply chain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06733*.
- Tianyu Gu, Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2019. Badnets: Evaluating backdoor attacks on deep neural networks. *IEEE Access*, 7:47230–47244.
- Suchin Gururangan, Swabha Swayamdipta, Omer Levy, Roy Schwartz, Samuel Bowman, and Noah A. Smith. 2018. Annotation artifacts in natural language inference data. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 107–112, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bo Han, Quanming Yao, Xingrui Yu, Gang Niu, Miao Xu, Weihua Hu, Ivor Tsang, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2018. Co-teaching: Robust training of deep neural networks with extremely noisy labels. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- He He, Sheng Zha, and Haohan Wang. 2019. Unlearn dataset bias in natural language inference by fitting the residual. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Deep Learning Approaches for Low-Resource NLP (DeepLo 2019)*, pages 132–142, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Geoffrey E Hinton. 2002. Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural computation*, 14(8):1771–1800.
- Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, and Dingli Yu. 2020. Simple and effective regularization methods for training on noisily labeled data with generalization guarantee. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Robin Jia and Percy Liang. 2017. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2021–2031, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lu Jiang, Zhengyuan Zhou, Thomas Leung, Li-Jia Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2018. Mentornet: Learning data-driven curriculum for very deep neural networks on corrupted labels. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2304–2313. PMLR.
- Lesheng Jin, Zihan Wang, and Jingbo Shang. 2022. Wedef: Weakly supervised backdoor defense for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11803*.
- Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, Yonatan Belinkov, and James Henderson. 2020. End-to-end bias mitigation by modelling biases in corpora. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8706–8716, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Keita Kurita, Paul Michel, and Graham Neubig. 2020. Weight poisoning attacks on pretrained models. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2793–2806, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Junnan Li, Richard Socher, and Steven C.H. Hoi. 2020. Dividemix: Learning with noisy labels as semi-supervised learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Linyang Li, Demin Song, Xiaonan Li, Jiehang Zeng, Ruotian Ma, and Xipeng Qiu. 2021a. Backdoor attacks on pre-trained models by layerwise weight poisoning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3023–3032, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shikun Li, Xiaobo Xia, Shiming Ge, and Tongliang Liu. 2022. Selective-supervised contrastive learning with noisy labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 316–325.
- Yige Li, Xixiang Lyu, Nodens Koren, Lingjuan Lyu, Bo Li, and Xingjun Ma. 2021b. Anti-backdoor learning: Training clean models on poisoned data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:14900–14912.
- Yige Li, Xixiang Lyu, Nodens Koren, Lingjuan Lyu, Bo Li, and Xingjun Ma. 2021c. Neural attention distillation: Erasing backdoor triggers from deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zichao Li, Dheeraj Mekala, Chengyu Dong, and Jingbo Shang. 2021d. BFClass: A backdoor-free text classification framework. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 444–453, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Siddharth Garg. 2018. 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 21*, pages 273–294. Springer.
- Tongliang Liu and Dacheng Tao. 2015. Classification with noisy labels by importance reweighting. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 38(3):447–461.
- Michal Lukasik, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Aditya Menon, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2020. Does label smoothing mitigate label noise? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6448–6458. PMLR.

- Weimin Lyu, Songzhu Zheng, Tengfei Ma, and Chao Chen. 2022a. [A study of the attention abnormality in trojaned BERTs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4727–4741, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Youngang Lyu, Piji Li, Yechang Yang, Maarten de Rijke, Pengjie Ren, Yukun Zhao, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2022b. Feature-level debiased natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05421*.
- Duc Tam Nguyen, Chaithanya Kumar Mummadi, Thi Phuong Nhung Ngo, Thi Hoai Phuong Nguyen, Laura Beggel, and Thomas Brox. 2020. [Self: Learning to filter noisy labels with self-ensembling](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tuan Anh Nguyen and Anh Tuan Tran. 2021. [Wanet - imperceptible warping-based backdoor attack](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lu Pang, Tao Sun, Haibin Ling, and Chao Chen. 2022. Backdoor cleansing with unlabeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12044*.
- Adam Poliak, Jason Naradowsky, Aparajita Haldar, Rachel Rudinger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. [Hypothesis only baselines in natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 180–191, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanchao Qi, Yangyi Chen, Mukai Li, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2021a. [ONION: A simple and effective defense against textual backdoor attacks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9558–9566, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanchao Qi, Yangyi Chen, Xurui Zhang, Mukai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2021b. [Mind the style of text! adversarial and backdoor attacks based on text style transfer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4569–4580, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanchao Qi, Mukai Li, Yangyi Chen, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Yasheng Wang, and Maosong Sun. 2021c. [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 (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 443–453, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanchao Qi, Yuan Yao, Sophia Xu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2021d. [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 (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4873–4883, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog*.
- Scott Reed, Honglak Lee, Dragomir Anguelov, Christian Szegedy, Dumitru Erhan, and Andrew Rabinovich. 2014. Training deep neural networks on noisy labels with bootstrapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6596*.
- Mengye Ren, Wenyuan Zeng, Bin Yang, and Raquel Urtasun. 2018. Learning to reweight examples for robust deep learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4334–4343. PMLR.
- Aniruddha Saha, Ajinkya Tejankar, Soroush Abbasi Koohpayegani, and Hamed Pirsiavash. 2022. Backdoor attacks on self-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13337–13346.
- Victor Sanh, Thomas Wolf, Yonatan Belinkov, and Alexander M Rush. 2021. [Learning from others' mistakes: Avoiding dataset biases without modeling them](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zeyang Sha, Xinlei He, Pascal Berrang, Mathias Humbert, and Yang Zhang. 2022. Fine-tuning is all you need to mitigate backdoor attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09067*.
- Jun Shu, Qi Xie, Lixuan Yi, Qian Zhao, Sanping Zhou, Zongben Xu, and Deyu Meng. 2019. Meta-weightnet: Learning an explicit mapping for sample weighting. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Alexander Turner, Dimitris Tsipras, and Aleksander Madry. 2019. Label-consistent backdoor attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02771*.
- Prasetya Ajie Utama, Nafise Sadat Moosavi, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Towards debiasing NLU models from unknown biases](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7597–7610, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Fei Wang, James Y. Huang, Tianyi Yan, Wenxuan Zhou, and Muhao Chen. 2023. Robust natural language understanding with residual attention debiasing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2023*.
- Zhao Wang and Aron Culotta. 2020. Identifying spurious correlations for robust text classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3431–3440, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongxin Wei, Lei Feng, Xiangyu Chen, and Bo An. 2020a. Combating noisy labels by agreement: A joint training method with co-regularization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13726–13735.
- Hongxin Wei, Lei Feng, Rundong Wang, and Bo An. 2020b. Metainfonet: Learning task-guided information for sample reweighting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05273*.
- M. J. Wolf, K. Miller, and F. S. Grodzinsky. 2017. Why we should have seen that coming: Comments on microsoft’s tay “experiment,” and wider implications. *SIGCAS Comput. Soc.*, 47(3):54–64.
- Xiaobo Xia, Tongliang Liu, Bo Han, Chen Gong, Nannan Wang, Zongyuan Ge, and Yi Chang. 2021. Robust early-learning: Hindering the memorization of noisy labels. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xiaobo Xia, Tongliang Liu, Bo Han, Mingming Gong, Jun Yu, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2022. Sample selection with uncertainty of losses for learning with noisy labels. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Wenkai Yang, Lei Li, Zhiyuan Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Xu Sun, and Bin He. 2021a. 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*, pages 2048–2058, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenkai Yang, Yankai Lin, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. 2021b. 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*, pages 8365–8381, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xingrui Yu, Bo Han, Jiangchao Yao, Gang Niu, Ivor Tsang, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2019. How does disagreement help generalization against label corruption? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7164–7173. PMLR.
- Xinyang Zhang, Zheng Zhang, Shouling Ji, and Ting Wang. 2021. Trojaning language models for fun and profit. In *2021 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 179–197. IEEE Computer Society.
- Zaixi Zhang, Qi Liu, Zhicai Wang, Zepu Lu, and Qingyong Hu. 2023. Backdoor defense via deconfounded representation learning. *CoRR*, abs/2303.06818.
- Zhiyuan Zhang, Lingjuan Lyu, Xingjun Ma, Chenguang Wang, and Xu Sun. 2022. Fine-mixing: Mitigating backdoors in fine-tuned language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 355–372, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Songzhu Zheng, Pengxiang Wu, Aman Goswami, Mayank Goswami, Dimitris Metaxas, and Chao Chen. 2020. Error-bounded correction of noisy labels. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11447–11457. PMLR.
- Wenxuan Zhou and Muhao Chen. 2021. Learning from noisy labels for entity-centric information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5381–5392, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.