

# Can We Rely on AI?

Desmond J. Higham\*

August 2023

## Abstract

Over the last decade, adversarial attack algorithms have revealed instabilities in deep learning tools. These algorithms raise issues regarding safety, reliability and interpretability in artificial intelligence; especially in high risk settings. From a practical perspective, there has been a war of escalation between those developing attack and defence strategies. At a more theoretical level, researchers have also studied bigger picture questions concerning the existence and computability of attacks. Here we give a brief overview of the topic, focusing on aspects that are likely to be of interest to researchers in applied and computational mathematics.

## 1 Introduction

We are currently living in a world where

- automated driving systems can misinterpret traffic “Stop” signs as speed limit signs when minimal graffiti is added [12],
- artificial intelligence (AI) algorithms for medical imaging, microscopy and other inverse problems in the sciences can introduce hallucinations [3, 17],

---

\*School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, James Clerk Maxwell Building, Edinburgh, UK. This manuscript was prepared as an Extended Abstract submission for the 21st International Conference of Numerical Analysis and Applied Mathematics, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, 2023.

- methods that aim to “explain” or “interpret” the decisions from an AI system may be superficial or unreliable [11, 13],
- carefully tailored prompts can persuade chatbox-style large language models to generate offensive or sensitive material [21, 9, 32].

At the heart of these issues is the concept of *instability*—extreme sensitivity of the output to changes in the input. In this brief manuscript we describe how AI instabilities have been identified and analysed, aiming at a readership in applied and computational mathematics.

## 2 Adversarial Attacks

Let us focus now on image classification. In Figure 1 we show a successful *adversarial attack*. This computation was performed with the MATLAB Deep Learning Toolbox [24], after slightly editing the relevant demonstration code<sup>1</sup>. (The only significant edit was changing “great white shark” to “cabbage butterfly.”) The computation uses `squeezenet`, an 18 layer convolutional neural network that has been trained on over a million images from the ImageNet database <http://www.image-net.org>. The network classifies an image into one of 1000 object categories. On the left in Figure 1 we show an image from the ImageNet data set which is correctly classified by `squeezenet` as a golden retriever. On the right we show the image arising when a specific, small perturbation is made. The perturbation was computed using an attack algorithm that has access to the inner workings of the network, along the lines of the ideas in [20, 1]. Here, the attack algorithm is designed to produce a perturbed image that is unchanged according to the human eye, but is now classified by `squeezenet` as a cabbage butterfly, and these goals were achieved.

The observation that convolutional neural networks are vulnerable to computable adversarial perturbations was made in [29]; see also [14] for further seminal work on this topic. Such perturbations may be found by evaluating, or estimating, the sensitivity of the classifier output (or the loss function that is used to judge goodness-of-fit) to small changes in the input pixel values. A “steepest ascent” direction is then available that, locally, has the most damaging effect.

Many variants of this basic idea have been studied:

---

<sup>1</sup><https://uk.mathworks.com/help/deeplearning/ug/generate-adversarial-examples.html>.

**Original: golden retriever    Adversarial: cabbage butterfly**




Figure 1: Left: an image from ImageNet that is correctly classified as a golden retriever by a convolutional neural network. Right: after a small, visually imperceptible, perturbation is made, the image is now classified as a cabbage butterfly.

- In Figure 1 we formed a *targeted attack*, asking for the new class to be “cabbage butterfly.” An *untargeted attack* would have the simpler aim of seeking any change to the output class.
- Figure 1 shows a *white box* attack—the attack algorithm has access to the partial derivatives of the classifier output and loss function with respect to the input pixels. A corresponding *black box* attack has access only to input and output pairs; in this case certain partial derivatives can be estimated via finite differencing.
- The attack in Figure 1 applies to a single image. In practice it has been observed that the same perturbation can lead to misclassification across many images and across different deep learning networks, leading to so-called *universal attacks* [25, 19].
- The algorithm in Figure 1 looked for a small perturbation as measured in the Euclidean norm (regarding the pixels as forming a large input vector). Alternative norms may be used [18, 28] and more tailored relative componentwise perturbations may be implemented [5].

- Attacks may be made on the parameters that define the network [6, 16, 33, 26, 31, 30].

In tandem with attack algorithms, there have been a wealth of defence strategies; including *adversarial training* [23], where a network is retrained on perturbed data points using a robust optimization approach. Currently, within this extensive cat-and-mouse game there is no guaranteed safeguard against adversaries [2]. Indeed, the author in [8] argues that “Historically, the vast majority of adversarial defenses published at top-tier conferences ... are quickly broken.” We also note that vulnerability to misclassification raises major questions around the usefulness of add-on strategies that aim to “explain” or “interpret” system outputs [11, 13]. For the picture on the right in Figure 1, there is clearly no valid post-hoc explanation for the “cabbage butterfly” classification.

### 3 Higher Level Issues

Alongside the development of heuristic attack and defence algorithms, researchers have also addressed the overarching question of whether, under reasonable assumptions, it is inevitable that classification tools will be vulnerable to attack. Of course, in order to prove rigorous results it is necessary to make assumptions about the training data, testing data and classifier. In [4] the accuracy-robustness tradeoff is studied, and it is shown that any approach to training a neural network with a fixed architecture must allow for examples of either inaccuracy or instability. The authors in [27, 31] look at the asymptotic limit of high-dimensional data (i.e., large numbers of pixels), where concentration of measure effects are relevant, and show that under appropriate assumptions it is inevitable that adversarial examples will exist. In [30] a concrete “stealth attack” algorithm that perturbs parameters in a neural network is introduced. Unusually, this algorithm is amenable to rigorous analysis, and it can be shown to have a high probability of success in an appropriate high-dimensional limit.

Although “inevitability of vulnerability” results paint a worrying picture for the use of AI, they may also help in the design of more stable systems. In order to work around an inevitability result we must ensure that one or more of the assumptions under which the result was proved does not hold. In the case of results that apply in asymptotically high dimension, one reasonable

approach is to estimate, and, if necessary reduce, the real, or *intrinsic*, dimension that operates in the input space and through the layers of a neural network—this might be much less than the nominal dimension [10]. (For example, the space of natural images may lie on a lower dimensional manifold than the overall pixel space.) We also note that concentration of measure effects can be used to motivate on-the-fly fixes for large, expensively trained systems when a small number of errors have been identified [15]. Moreover, there has been some progress in establishing that guaranteed benefits arise from adversarial training; see, for example, [7].

## 4 Implications for Regulation

The increasing prevalence of AI in our everyday lives is raising concerns around data protection, privacy, safety, ethics, defence, security, and the use of the earth’s natural resources. Understanding and addressing these issues requires a multi-disciplinary approach, combining expertise across the computational, engineering, political and social sciences, as well as business, law and philosophy. We argue here that more fundamental concerns, arising at a mathematical level, should be added to this mix. AI systems may possess inherent vulnerabilities, preventing them from operating as intended and making them susceptible to adversarial attacks.

These concerns are becoming highly relevant as governmental bodies seek to regulate AI. For example: “The AI Act is a proposed regulation by the European Union that aims to establish a legal framework for the development, deployment, and use of AI systems in the EU” [22]. The current version of the proposed act would oblige providers of AI systems intended for high-risk applications to comply with a range of requirements, including *technical robustness*. Similarly, Section 3.2.3 of the UK Government policy paper *AI regulation: a pro-innovation approach* (updated August, 2023) recommends five cross-sectoral principles, two of which are *Safety, security and robustness* and *Appropriate transparency and explainability*. There is a well-defined sense in which such goals are mathematically unachievable. In order to create regulations that can withstand mathematical scrutiny, it is clear that terms such as robustness, safety and explainability must be articulated in sufficient detail (along with the term AI itself), and known results about the fundamental limitations of algorithms that are designed to perform inference and decision making must be acknowledged.

**Acknowledgements** DJH was supported by EPSRC grants EP/P020720/1 and EP/V046527/1. The experiment summarized in Figure 1 can be performed by changing “great white shark” to “cabbage butterfly” in the demonstration code at

<https://uk.mathworks.com/help/deeplearning/ug/generate-adversarial-examples.html>.

## References

- [1] *Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks*, arXiv preprint arXiv: 1706.06083, (2019).
- [2] N. AKHTAR AND A. MIAN, *Threat of adversarial attacks on deep learning in computer vision: A survey*, IEEE Access, 6 (2018), pp. 14410–14430.
- [3] V. ANTUN, F. RENNA, C. POON, B. ADCOCK, AND A. C. HANSEN, *On instabilities of deep learning in image reconstruction and the potential costs of AI*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, (2020).
- [4] A. BASTOUNIS, A. C. HANSEN, AND V. VLAČIĆ, *The mathematics of adversarial attacks in AI—Why deep learning is unstable despite the existence of stable neural networks*, arXiv:2109.06098 [cs.LG], (2021).
- [5] L. BEERENS AND D. J. HIGHAM, *Adversarial ink: componentwise backward error attacks on deep learning*, IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics, (2023), p. hxad017.
- [6] J. BREIER, X. HOU, D. JAP, L. MA, S. BHASIN, AND Y. LIU, *Practical fault attack on deep neural networks*, in ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS), ACM, 2018, pp. 2204–2206.
- [7] L. BUNGERT AND K. STINSON, *Gamma-convergence of a nonlocal perimeter arising in adversarial machine learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv: 2211.15223, (2022).
- [8] N. CARLINI, *A LLM assisted exploitation of AI-Guardian*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15008, (2023).

- [9] N. CARLINI, M. NASR, C. A. CHOQUETTE-CHOO, M. JAGIELSKI, I. GAO, A. AWADALLA, P. W. KOH, D. IPPOLITO, K. LEE, F. TRAMÈR, AND L. SCHMIDT, *Are aligned neural networks adversarially aligned?*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15447, (2023).
- [10] Z. CUI AND P. GRINDROD, *Mappings, dimensionality and reversing out of deep neural networks*, IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics, (2023), p. hxad019.
- [11] A.-K. DOMBROWSKI, M. ALBER, C. ANDERS, M. ACKERMANN, K.-R. MÜLLER, AND P. KESSEL, *Explanations can be manipulated and geometry is to blame*, in NeurIPS, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, eds., vol. 32, Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [12] I. EVTIMOV, K. EYKHOLT, E. FERNANDES, T. KOHNO, B. LI, A. PRAKASH, A. RAHMATI, AND D. SONG, *Robust physical-world attacks on machine learning models*, CoRR, abs/1707.08945 (2017).
- [13] M. GHASSEMI, L. OAKDEN-RAYNER, AND A. L. BEAM, *The false hope of current approaches to explainable artificial intelligence in health care*, The Lancet Digital Health, 3 (2021), pp. e745–e750.
- [14] I. J. GOODFELLOW, J. SHLENS, AND C. SZEGEDY, *Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples*, in 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, San Diego, CA, Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun, eds., 2015.
- [15] A. GORBAN, B. GRECHUK, AND I. TYUKIN, *Stochastic separation theorems: How geometry may help to correct AI errors*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc., 70 (2022), pp. 25–33.
- [16] T. GU, K. LIU, B. DOLAN-GAVITT, AND S. GARG, *BadNets: Evaluating backdooring attacks on deep neural networks*, IEEE Access, 7 (2019), pp. 47230–47244.
- [17] D. P. HOFFMAN, I. SLAVITT, AND C. A. FITZPATRICK, *The promise and peril of deep learning in microscopy*, Nature Methods, 18 (2021), pp. 131–132.

- [18] R. HUANG, B. XU, D. SCHUURMANS, AND C. SZEPESVARI, *Learning with a strong adversary*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03034, (2017).
- [19] V. KHRULKOV AND I. OSELEDETS, *Art of singular vectors and universal adversarial perturbations*, in IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2018.
- [20] A. KURAKIN, I. GOODFELLOW, AND S. BENGIO, *Adversarial examples in the physical world*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02533, (2016).
- [21] B. LIU, B. XIAO, X. JIANG, S. CEN, X. HE, AND W. DOU, *Adversarial attacks on large language model-based system and mitigating strategies: A case study on ChatGPT*, Security and Communication Networks, (2023), p. 8691095.
- [22] T. MADIEGA, *Briefing Document: Artificial intelligence act*, European Parliamentary Research Service, 2023.
- [23] A. MADRY, A. MAKELOV, L. SCHMIDT, D. TSIPRAS, AND A. VLADU, *Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks*, in 6th International Conference on Learning Representations, Vancouver, 2018.
- [24] MATLAB, *version 9.13.0.2080170 (R2022b)*, The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, 2022.
- [25] S. MOOSAVI-DEZFOOLI, A. FAWZI, O. FAWZI, AND P. FROSSARD, *Universal adversarial perturbations*, in 2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2017, pp. 86–94.
- [26] X. QI, J. ZHU, C. XIE, AND Y. YANG, *Subnet replacement: Deployment-stage backdoor attack against deep neural networks in gray-box setting*, ICLR 2021 Workshop on Security and Safety in Machine Learning System, (2021).
- [27] A. SHAFABI, W. HUANG, C. STUDER, S. FEIZI, AND T. GOLDSTEIN, *Are adversarial examples inevitable?*, International Conference on Learning Representations, New Orleans, USA, (2019).
- [28] J. SU, D. V. VARGAS, AND S. KOUICHI, *One pixel attack for fooling deep neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv: 1710.08864, (2017).



- [29] C. SZEGEDY, W. ZAREMBA, I. SUTSKEVER, J. BRUNA, D. ERHAN, I. GOODFELLOW, AND R. FERGUS, *Intriguing properties of neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199, (2013).
- [30] I. Y. TYUKIN, D. J. HIGHAM, A. BASTOUNIS, E. WOLDEGEORGIS, AND A. N. GORBAN, *The feasibility and inevitability of stealth attacks*, arXiv:2106.13997, (2021).
- [31] I. Y. TYUKIN, D. J. HIGHAM, AND A. N. GORBAN, *On adversarial examples and stealth attacks in artificial intelligence systems*, in 2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [32] Y. WOLF, N. WIES, O. AVNERY, Y. LEVINE, AND A. SHASHUA, *Fundamental limitations of alignment in large language models*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11082, (2023).
- [33] F. YAO, A. S. RAKIN, AND D. FAN, *DeepHammer: Depleting the intelligence of deep neural networks through targeted chain of bit flips*, Proceedings of the 29th USENIX Security Symposium, (2020).