
Pixel is a Barrier: Diffusion Models Are More Adversarially Robust Than We Think

Haotian Xue

Georgia Institute of Technology
htxue.ai@gatech.edu

Yongxin Chen

Georgia Institute of Technology
yongchen@gatech.edu

Abstract

Adversarial examples for diffusion models are widely used as solutions for safety concerns. By adding adversarial perturbations to personal images, attackers can not edit or imitate them easily. However, it is essential to note that all these protections target the latent diffusion model (LDMs), the adversarial examples for diffusion models in the pixel space (PDMs) are largely overlooked. This may mislead us to think that the diffusion models are vulnerable to adversarial attacks like most deep models. In this paper, we show novel findings that: even though gradient-based white-box attacks can be used to attack the LDMs, they fail to attack PDMs. This finding is supported by extensive experiments of almost a wide range of attacking methods on various PDMs and LDMs with different model structures, which means diffusion models are indeed much more robust against adversarial attacks. We also find that PDMs can be used as an off-the-shelf purifier to effectively remove the adversarial patterns that were generated on LDMs to protect the images, which means that most protection methods nowadays, to some extent, cannot protect our images from malicious attacks. We hope that our insights will inspire the community to rethink the adversarial samples for diffusion models as protection methods and move forward to more effective protection. Codes are available in <https://github.com/xavihart/PDM-Pure>.

1 Introduction

Generative diffusion models [14, 39, 32] have achieved great success in generating images with high fidelity. The strong generative power also brings safety concerns [43], especially regarding the unauthorized editing or imitation of personal images, such as portraits or individual artworks [2, 35]. Many recent works [20, 36, 33, 41, 49, 5, 1, 22] show that adversarial samples (adv-samples) for diffusion models can be applied as a protection against malicious editing. Small perturbations generated by conventional methods in adversarial machine learning [23, 11] can effectively fool popular diffusion models e.g. Stable Diffusion [32] to produce chaotic results. However, a significantly overlooked aspect is that all the previous works focus on latent diffusion models (LDMs), but the original pixel-space diffusion models (PDMs) are not studied. For LDMs, perturbations are not directly introduced to the input of the diffusion models, instead, they are applied externally, outside the encoder. Previous works [45, 41] have shown that the encoder-decoder of LDMs is vulnerable to adversarial perturbations, which means that the adv-samples for LDMs have a very different mechanism compared with the adv-samples for general PDMs. In this paper, we call attention to rethink the adversarial attacks nowadays for diffusion models:

Can we generate adversarial examples for PDMs as we did for LDMs?

Instead of attacking the diffusion process itself, current adversarial examples for Latent Diffusion Models heavily rely on attacking the encoder: Glaze [36] is built on minimizing the distance between the attacked image and the target image in the latent space defined by the encoder. Additionally,




Figure 1: **Pixel is a Barrier for Attacking DMs:** (a) Pixel-based diffusion models (PDMs) are harder to attack using white-box attacks like project-gradient-descent than diffusion models in the latent space (LDMs). (b) Strong PDM can be easily used as a universal purifier to effectively remove the protective perturbation generated by existing protection methods. (c) Pixel is a barrier and the pixel-space diffusion model is quite robust, we cannot achieve real safety and protection if pixel-space diffusion is not attacked. (Zoom in for better observation)

Mist [19] demonstrates the significance of combining the textural loss derived from the encoder to generate better adversarial samples. Moreover, SDS-attack [41] further investigates that, the gradient of denoising process is weak and unstable, and the real bottleneck of attacking an LDM is attacking the encoder.

In this paper, we fix the absence of study on adv-samples for PDMs in the field of adv-samples for diffusion models. We do experiments on various LDMs or PDMs with different architectures (e.g. U-Net [14] or Transformer [28]), different training datasets, and with different input resolutions (e.g. 64, 256, 512). Through extensive experiments, we surprisingly find that all the existing methods we tested [19, 49, 36, 41, 5, 33, 20], targeting to attack LDMs, cannot be used to generate adv-samples for PDMs. This also means that PDMs show stronger adversarial robustness than we think. More importantly, it means that the previous adversarial examples for diffusion models (AdvDM) are, in fact, one special case of adv-samples for LDMs (AdvLDM) only.

Since PDMs are strongly robust against adversarial perturbations, we further propose that the PDMs, trained on large datasets, can serve as a universal purifier that can effectively remove the protective perturbations of different scales (e.g. Mist-v2 [49] and Glaze [36]). While GrIDPure [48] shows that we can apply diffusion models in different resolutions to purify our image patch-by-patch, they miss that the key is in fact the pixel space, not the resolution.

Pixel is a barrier, the original reverse process of PDMs introduces large randomness directly in the pixel space, making the whole system quite robust to be fooled to generate bad samples. Pixel is also a barrier preventing us from achieving real protection using adversarial perturbations since strong PDMs can be utilized to remove the out-of-distribution perturbations [42]. Our work calls for attention to rethink the problem of adv-samples for DM, and also rethink whether adv-samples can protect our images. Finally, our contributions are listed below:

1. We revisit adversarial examples for diffusion models by investigating PDMs, an area that has largely been overlooked in this field. Existing attacks on LDMs **can not** be applied to attack PDMs, which means that PDMs show superior robustness against adversarial perturbations.
2. Based on the new insights, we propose a simple but effective framework to apply strong PDMs as **a universal purifier** to remove attack-agnostic adversarial perturbations, easily bypassing current protective methods.
3. We emphasize that **pixel is a barrier**, the community should rethink the adv-samples for DMs and whether current protections based on adv-samples for LDMs, really provide effective protection.

2 Related Works

Safety Issues in Diffusion Models The strong generative power of the diffusion models (DMs) has raised numerous safety issues [43, 35, 2]. As a result, there has been a growing number of works trying to prevent DMs from being abused. Some of them work on the protection of intellectual property of diffusion models by applying watermarks [47, 29, 6], some of them work on concept removal to prevent the DMs from generating NSFW images [12, 44, 10]. In the era of strong




Figure 2: **PDMs Cannot be Attacked as LDMs:** (a) LDMs can be easily fooled but PDMs cannot be, (b) Even End-to-End attack does not work for PDMs.

generative models, caution should be taken to guarantee the safe and responsible application of these models.

Adversarial Examples for DMs Adversarial samples [11, 4, 36] are clean samples perturbed by an imperceptible small noise, which can fool the deep neural networks into making wrong decisions. Under the white-box settings, gradient-based methods are widely used to generate adv-samples. Among them, the projected gradient descent (PGD) algorithm [23] is one of the most effective ways. Recent works [20, 33] show that it is also easy to find adv-samples for diffusion models (AdvDM): with a proper loss to attack the denoising process, the perturbed image can fool the diffusion models to generate chaotic images when operating diffusion-based mimicry. Furthermore, many improved algorithms [49, 5, 41] have been proposed to generate better AdvDM samples. However, as far as we know, all the AdvDM samples listed above work on LDMs, while the PDMs are rarely explored.

Adversarial Perturbation as Protection Adversarial perturbation against diffusion models turns out to be a method to safeguard our images against unauthorized editing [20, 36, 33, 41, 49, 5, 1, 22]. Some applications are provided such as Glaze [36] and Mist [49, 19] for individual artists to protect their creations. SDS-attack [41] further investigates the mechanism behind the attack and proposes some tools to make the protection more effective. However, they are limited to protecting LDMs without further investigating whether they can work for more general PDMs.

3 Preliminaries

Generative Diffusion Models The generative diffusion model (GDM) [14, 39] is one kind of generative model, which shows great generative power in numerous fields such as image [32, 3], 3D [30, 21], video [15, 38], story [27, 31] and music [25, 17] generation. Diffusion models, like other generative models, are parametrized model $p_\theta(\hat{x}_0)$ that can estimate an unknown distribution $q(x_0)$, for the image generation tasks, $q(x_0)$ is the distribution of real images.

There are two processes in a diffusion model, the forward diffusion process and the reverse denoising process. The forward diffusion process progressively injects noise into the clean image, and the t -th step diffusion is formulated as $q(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t}x_{t-1}, \beta_t\mathbf{I})$. Accumulating the noise, we have: $q_t(x_t | x_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}x_0, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_t)\mathbf{I})$, where β_t growing from 0 to 1 are pre-defined values, $\alpha_t = 1 - \beta_t$, and $\bar{\alpha}_t = \prod_{s=1}^t \alpha_s$. Finally, x_T will become approximately an isotropic Gaussian random variable when $\bar{\alpha}_t \rightarrow 0$.

Models	FID-score \uparrow			SSIM \downarrow			LPIPS \uparrow			IA-Score \downarrow			Type
$\delta = 4/255$	Clean	Adv	Δ	Clean	Adv	Δ	Clean	Adv	Δ	Clean	Adv	Δ	
DiT-256	131	167	+36	0.37	0.35	-0.02	0.44	0.54	+0.10	0.74	0.70	-0.04	LDM
SD-V-1.4	44	114	+70	0.68	0.55	-0.13	0.22	0.46	+0.24	0.92	0.84	-0.08	LDM
SD-V-1.5	45	113	+68	0.73	0.59	-0.14	0.20	0.38	+0.138	0.94	0.89	-0.05	LDM
GD-ImageNet	109	109	+0	0.66	0.66	-0.00	0.21	0.21	+0.00	0.90	0.90	-0.00	PDM
IF-I	186	187	+1	0.59	0.58	-0.01	0.14	0.14	+0.00	0.86	0.86	-0.00	PDM
IF-II	85	87	+2	0.84	0.84	-0.00	0.15	0.15	+0.00	0.91	0.91	-0.00	PDM
$\delta = 8/255$	Clean	Adv	Δ	Clean	Adv	Δ	Clean	Adv	Δ	Clean	Adv	Δ	
DiT-256	131	186	+55	0.37	0.31	-0.06	0.44	0.63	+0.19	0.74	0.66	-0.08	LDM
SD-V-1.4	44	178	+134	0.68	0.44	-0.24	0.22	0.60	+0.38	0.92	0.78	-0.14	LDM
SD-V-1.5	45	179	+134	0.73	0.49	-0.24	0.20	0.51	+0.31	0.94	0.84	-0.10	LDM
GD-ImageNet	109	110	+1	0.66	0.64	-0.02	0.21	0.22	+0.01	0.90	0.90	-0.00	PDM
IF-I	186	188	+2	0.59	0.59	-0.00	0.14	0.14	+0.00	0.86	0.86	+0.00	PDM
IF-II	85	82	-3	0.84	0.83	-0.01	0.15	0.16	+0.01	0.91	0.92	+0.01	PDM
$\delta = 16/255$	clean	adv	Δ	clean	adv	Δ	clean	adv	Δ	clean	adv	Δ	
DiT-256	131	220	+89	0.37	0.26	-0.11	0.44	0.70	+0.26	0.74	0.63	-0.11	LDM
SD-V-1.4	44	225	+181	0.68	0.34	-0.34	0.22	0.68	+0.46	0.92	0.72	-0.20	LDM
SD-V-1.5	45	226	+181	0.73	0.37	-0.36	0.20	0.62	+0.42	0.94	0.78	-0.16	LDM
GD-ImageNet	109	110	+1	0.66	0.57	-0.09	0.21	0.26	+0.05	0.90	0.89	-0.01	PDM
IF-I	186	188	+2	0.59	0.58	-0.01	0.14	0.15	+0.01	0.86	0.87	+0.01	PDM
IF-II	85	86	+1	0.84	0.76	-0.08	0.15	0.21	+0.06	0.91	0.95	+0.04	PDM

Table 1: **Quantitative Measurement of PGD-based Adv-Attacks for LDMs and PDMs:** gradient-based diffusion attacks can attack LDMs effectively, making the difference Δ across all evaluation metrics between edited clean image and edited adversarial image large, which means the quality of edited images drops dramatically (in red). However, the PDMs are not affected by the crafted adversarial perturbations, showing small Δ before and after the attacks.

Reversely, $p_\theta(\hat{x}_{t-1}|\hat{x}_t)$ can generate samples from Gaussian $\hat{x}_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$, where p_θ be re-parameterized by learning a noise estimator ϵ_θ , the training loss is $\mathbb{E}_{t, x_0, \epsilon}[\lambda(t)\|\epsilon_\theta(x_t, t) - \epsilon\|^2]$, where ϵ is the noise used to diffuse x_0 following $q_t(x_t|x_0)$. Finally, by iteratively applying $p_\theta(\hat{x}_{t-1}|\hat{x}_t)$, we can sample realistic images following $p_\theta(\hat{x}_0)$.

Since the above diffusion process operates directly in the pixel space, we call such diffusion models Pixel-Space Diffusion Models (PDMs). Another popular choice is to move the diffusion process into the latent space, to make it more effective, resulting in the Latent Diffusion Models (LDMs) [32]. More specifically, LDMs first use an encoder \mathcal{E}_ϕ parameterized by ϕ to encode x_0 into a latent variable: $z_0 = \mathcal{E}_\phi(x_0)$, the denoising diffusion process is the same as PDMs, at the end of the denoising process, \hat{z}_0 can be projected back to the pixel space using decoder \mathcal{D}_ψ parameterized by ψ as $\hat{x}_0 = \mathcal{D}_\psi(\hat{z}_0)$.

Adversarial Examples for Diffusion Model Recent works [33, 20] find that adding small perturbations to our clean images will make the diffusion models perform badly in noise prediction and further generate chaotic results in tasks like image editing and customized generation. The adversarial perturbations for LDMs can be generated by optimizing the Monte-Carlo-based adversarial loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{adv}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{t, \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{z_t \sim q_t(\mathcal{E}_\phi(x))} \|\epsilon_\theta(z_t, t) - \epsilon\|_2^2 \quad (1)$$

other encoder-based losses [36, 19, 49, 41] further enhance the attack to make it more powerful and more effective. With the carefully designed adversarial loss, we can run Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) [23] with ℓ_∞ budget δ to generate adversarial perturbations:

$$x^{t+1} = \mathcal{P}_{B_\infty(x, \delta)} [x^t + \eta \text{sign} \nabla_{x^t} \mathcal{L}_{adv}(x^t)] \quad (2)$$

in the above equation, $\mathcal{P}_{B_\infty(x, \delta)}(\cdot)$ is the projection operator on the ℓ_∞ ball. We use superscript x^k to represent the iterations of the PGD, using subscript x_t for the diffusion steps.

4 Rethinking Adversarial Examples for Diffusion Models

Adversarial examples of LDMs are widely adopted as one kind of protection, preventing unauthorized images from being edited or imitated [36, 19]. However, a significant issue overlooked in this research




Figure 3: **Apply strong PDM to remove protective noise:** It is quite easy to remove **unknown** protective perturbations using a strong PDM, here we use IF [37] by DeepFloyd, by simply applying SDEdit in the pixel domain, we can remove the noise created by all the protective methods, the purified image is **no more adversarial** and can be easily edited or imitated. Using the pixel-space diffusion model can preserve more details

is that all the adversarial examples are generated on LDMs, primarily due to the wide impact of the Stable Diffusion, while no attempts are made to attack any PDMs.

This blank space may mislead us to think that diffusion models, like most deep neural networks, are vulnerable to adversarial perturbations. We may think that the algorithms used in LDMs can be easily transferred to PDMs by simply applying the same adversarial loss in the pixel space formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{adv}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{t,\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{x_t \sim q_t(x)} \|\epsilon_\theta(x_t, t) - \epsilon\|_2^2 \quad (3)$$

However, we show that PDMs are quite robust against this form of attack, which means all the previous attacks against diffusion models are, in fact, special cases of attacks against the LDMs, partially due to the vulnerability of VAE as was explored by [41]. Before this work, people may think that diffusion models can be easily fooled, but the truth is that only LDMs are, the original PDMs are much more adversarially robust than you think. We did extensive experiments on popular LDMs and PDMs structures like DiT, Guided Diffusion, Stable Diffusion, and DeepFloyd, as we demonstrated in Table 1, only the LDMs can be attacked, the PDMs are not that susceptible to adversarial perturbations, more details and analysis will be in the experimental sections.

The vulnerability of the LDMs is caused by the vulnerability of the latent space [41], which means that although we may set budgets for perturbations in the pixel space, the perturbations in the latent space can be considerable. However, the PDMs directly work in the pixel space, so the denoiser will not be easily fooled, since it is trained to be robust to Gaussian noise of different levels.

Another important thing is that almost all the copyright protection perturbations [36, 19, 49] are based on the insight that: it is easy to craft adversarial examples to fool the diffusion models. We need to rethink the adversarial samples of diffusion models since there are a lot of PDMs that cannot be attacked easily. Moreover, we will show that PDMs can be utilized to purify all adversarial patterns generated by previous methods in Section 5. This new landscape poses new challenges to ensuring the security and robustness of diffusion-based copyright protection techniques.

5 PDM-Pure: PDM as a Strong Purifier

Considering the robustness of PDMs, a natural idea emerges: we can utilize them as a universal purification network. This approach could potentially eliminate any adversarial patterns without needing to know which kind of attacks they are generated by. We call this framework **PDM-Pure**, which is a general framework to deal with all the perturbations nowadays. To fully harness the capabilities of PDM-Pure, we need to meet two basic requirements: (1) The perturbation shows out-of-distribution pattern, this assumption also reflected in previous works on adversarial purification/attacks using diffusion models [26, 42] (2) The PDM we used is strong enough to represent $p(x_0)$, which can be largely determined by the dataset they are trained on.

We will show in detail how to use DeepFloyd-IF [37], which is the strongest PDM as far as we know, to apply PDM-Pure. DeepFloyd-IF is a cascaded text-to-image diffusion model trained on 1.2B text-image pairs from LAION dataset [34]. It contains three stages named IF-Stage I, II, and III. Here we only use Stage II and III since Stage I works in a resolution 64 which is too small. Given a perturbed image $x_{W \times H}$ sized $W \times H$, we first resized it into $x_{64 \times 64}$ and $x_{256 \times 256}$. Then we use a general prompt p (do not need any details) to do SDEdit [24] using the Stage II model:

Methods	AdvDM	AdvDM(-)	SDS(-)	SDS(+)	SDST	Photoguard	Mist	Mist-v2
Before Protection	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166
After Protection	297	221	231	299	322	375	372	370
Crop-Resize	210	271	228	217	280	295	289	288
JPEG	296	222	229	297	320	359	351	348
Adv-Clean	243	201	204	244	243	266	282	270
LDM-Pure	300	251	235	300	350	385	380	375
GridPure	200	182	195	200	210	220	230	210
PDM-Pure (ours)	161	170	165	159	179	175	178	170

Table 2: **Quantitative Measurement of Different Purification Methods in Different Scale (FID-score)**: PDM-Pure is the strongest to remove all the tested protection, under strong protection with $\delta = 16$. LDM-Pure cannot do purification, since the adversarial patterns can transfer well across LDMs.

$$x_t = \mathbf{IF-II}(x_{t+1}, x_{64 \times 64}, p) \quad (4)$$

where $t = T_{\text{edit}} - 1, \dots, 1, 0$, $x_{T_{\text{edit}}} = x_{256 \times 256}$, larger T_{edit} may be used for larger noise. x_0 is the purified image we get in the 256×256 resolution space, where the adversarial patterns should be already purified, then we can use IF Stage III to further up-sample it into 1024×1024 with $x_{1024 \times 1024} = \mathbf{IF-III}(x_0, p)$. Finally, we can sample into the original resolution $H \times W$ as we want. This whole process is demonstrated in Figure 3, after purification, the image is no longer adversarial to the targeted diffusion models and can be further used without any protection.

It should be noted that the pipeline we introduced above is just one special case of PDM-Pure, we can apply it to any other strong PDMs without largely changing the pipeline, the key idea is to purify the protected image in the pixel space. We will show that our proposed pipeline can purify the adversarial perturbations generated by all the protective methods we know, making us rethink whether protective perturbation is a good way to protect our images.

6 Experiments

In this section, we will carry on extensive experiments on various attacking methods and various models to support the following three conclusions:

- **(C1)**: PDMs are much more robust than LDMs, and PDMs can not be effectively attacked using PGD-attack with diffusion adversarial loss (Equation 1).
- **(C2)**: PDMs can be easily applied to purify all of the current protective perturbations we know, showing state-of-art purification power.
- **(C3)**: Pixel is a barrier for us to achieve real protection against diffusion-based mimicry, PDM-Pure will make the protective perturbation no more protective, but there is currently no effective way to attack PDMs.


6.1 Models, Datasets, and Metrics

The models we used can be categorized by LDMs and PDMs, for LDMs, we use Stable Diffusion V-1.4, V-1.5 (SD-V-1.4, SD-V-1.5) [32], and Diffusion Transformer (DiT-XL/2) [28]; for PDMs we use Guided Diffusion (GD) [8] trained on ImageNet [7], DeepFloyd Stage I and Stage II [37].

For models trained on the ImageNet (DiT, GD), we run adversarial attacks and purification on a 1k subset of the ImageNet validation dataset; for models trained on LAION, we run testing on the dataset proposed in [41], which includes 400 cartoon, artwork, landscape, and portrait images. The metrics to test the quality of generated images are included in the Appendix.

For protection methods, we collect almost all the famous approaches, including AdvDM [20], SDS [41], Mist [19], Mist-v2 [49], Photoguard [33] and Glaze [36]. We also test the methods in the design space proposed in [41], including SDS(-), AdvDM(-), and SDST, different from the previous methods, they are based on gradient descent and also show great performance deceiving the LDMs.

(a) Inpainting



(b) Textual Inversion



(c) LoRA Customization




Figure 4: **PDM-Pure makes the Protected Images no more Protected:** Here we show qualitative results of our PDM-Pure, specifically, we test the purified images on three scenarios where unauthorized editing may occur: Inpainting, Text-Inversion [9] and LoRA customization [16]. While the protected images will incur bad generation quality, the purified ones can fully bypass the protection.

6.2 (C1) PDMs are Much More Robust Than We Think

In Table 1, we attack different LDMs and PDMs with one of the most general and effective adversarial loss [49] in Equation 1, which can be interpreted as fooling the denoiser using a Monte-Carlo-based loss. Given the attacked samples, we test the SDEdit results on the attacked samples, which can be generally used to test whether the samples are adversarial for the diffusion model. We use FID-score [13], SSIM [40], LPIPS [46], and IA-Score [18] to measure the quality of the attack: if the quality of generated images decreases a lot compared with editing the clean images, then the attack is successful. We can see that LDMs can be easily attacked, while PDMs are quite robust: the quality of the edited images is still good. We also show some visualizations in Figure 2, which better demonstrates that the perturbation will affect the LDMs but not the PDMs.

To further investigate how robust PDM is, we try other advanced attacking methods, including the End-to-End Diffusion Attacks (E2E-Photoguard) proposed in [33] and the Improved Targeted Attack (ITA) proposed in [49]. Though the End-to-End attack is usually impractical to run, it shows the strongest performance to attack LDMs. We find that both attacks cannot work in PDM settings, we show attacked samples and edited samples in Figure ?? . In conclusion, previous adversarial samples for diffusion models can only attack the LDMs, and PDMs are more robust than we think.

6.3 (C2) PDM-Pure: A Universal Purifier that is Simple and Effective

PDM-Pure is simple, basically, we just run SDEdit to purify the protected image in the pixel space. Given our assumption that PDMs are quite robust, we can use PDMs trained on large-scale datasets as a universal black-box purifier. We follow the model pipeline introduced in Section 5 and purify images protected by various methods in Table 2.

PDM-Pure is effective, from Table 2 we can see that the purification will remove adversarial patterns for all the protection methods we tested, largely decreasing the FID score for the SDEdit task. Also, we test the protected images and purified images in more tasks including Image Inpainting [39], Textual-Inversion [9], and LoRA customization [16] in Figure 4. Both qualitative and quantitative results show that the purified images are no more adversarial, and can be effectively edited or imitated in different tasks without any obstruction.

Also, PDM-Pure shows SOTA results compared with previous purification methods, including some simple purifiers based on compression and filtering like Adv-Clean, crop-and-resize, and JPEG Compression; and SDEdit-based methods like GrIDPure [48]. We also add LDM-Pure as a baseline to show that LDMs can not be used to purify the protected images. For GrIDPure, we use Guided-Diffusion trained on ImageNet to run patchified purification. All the experiments are conducted on the datasets collected in [41] under the resolution of 512×512 .

6.4 (C3) Pixel is A Barrier: What Should We Do in the Future?

Pixel is a barrier for us to do real protection with adversarial attacks. Since PDMs are quite robust, they cannot be easily attacked and can even be used to purify the protective perturbations, challenging the current assumption for safety protection of generative diffusion models. The community should rethink the problem of adversarial samples for generative diffusion models and rethink can we rely on them to protect unauthorized images. Hence, diffusion models turn out to be quite robust, more research should be conducted to study them and the reason behind them. If the robustness can be verified and guaranteed, we may rely on it as a new structure for many other tasks.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we present novel insights: while many studies demonstrate the ease of finding adversarial samples for Latent Diffusion Models (LDMs), Pixel Diffusion Models (PDMs) exhibit far greater adversarial robustness than previously assumed. We are the first to investigate the adversarial samples for PDMs, revealing a surprising discovery that current attacks fail to fool PDMs. Leveraging this insight, we propose utilizing strong PDMs as universal purifiers, resulting in PDM-Pure, a simple and effective framework that can generate protective perturbations in a black-box manner. We prompt the community to reconsider adversarial examples for diffusion models and the efficacy of protective perturbations nowadays, inspiring future research to delve deeper into the mechanisms behind the robustness of diffusion models and propose better protective methodologies.

References

- [1] N. Ahn, W. Ahn, K. Yoo, D. Kim, and S.-H. Nam. Imperceptible protection against style imitation from diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19254*, 2024.
- [2] S. Andersen. Us district court for the northern district of california. January 2023.
- [3] Y. Balaji, S. Nah, X. Huang, A. Vahdat, J. Song, K. Kreis, M. Aittala, T. Aila, S. Laine, B. Catanzaro, et al. ediffi: Text-to-image diffusion models with an ensemble of expert denoisers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01324*, 2022.
- [4] N. Carlini and D. Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 39–57. Ieee, 2017.
- [5] J. Chen, J. Dong, and X. Xie. Exploring adversarial attacks against latent diffusion model from the perspective of adversarial transferability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07087*, 2024.
- [6] Y. Cui, J. Ren, H. Xu, P. He, H. Liu, L. Sun, and J. Tang. Diffusionshield: A watermark for copyright protection against generative diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04642*, 2023.
- [7] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [8] P. Dhariwal and A. Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:8780–8794, 2021.
- [9] R. Gal, Y. Alaluf, Y. Atzmon, O. Patashnik, A. H. Bermano, G. Chechik, and D. Cohen-Or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01618*, 2022.
- [10] R. Gandikota, H. Orgad, Y. Belinkov, J. Materzyńska, and D. Bau. Unified concept editing in diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14761*, 2023.
- [11] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- [12] A. Heng and H. Soh. Continual learning for forgetting in deep generative models. 2023.
- [13] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, and S. Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [14] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- [15] J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet. Video diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:8633–8646, 2022.
- [16] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [17] Q. Huang, D. S. Park, T. Wang, T. I. Denk, A. Ly, N. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Zhang, J. Yu, C. Frank, et al. Noise2music: Text-conditioned music generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03917*, 2023.
- [18] N. Kumari, B. Zhang, R. Zhang, E. Shechtman, and J.-Y. Zhu. Multi-concept customization of text-to-image diffusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1931–1941, 2023.
- [19] C. Liang and X. Wu. Mist: Towards improved adversarial examples for diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12683*, 2023.
- [20] C. Liang, X. Wu, Y. Hua, J. Zhang, Y. Xue, T. Song, Z. Xue, R. Ma, and H. Guan. Adversarial example does good: Preventing painting imitation from diffusion models via adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20763–20786. PMLR, 2023.
- [21] C.-H. Lin, J. Gao, L. Tang, T. Takikawa, X. Zeng, X. Huang, K. Kreis, S. Fidler, M.-Y. Liu, and T.-Y. Lin. Magic3d: High-resolution text-to-3d content creation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10440*, 2022.

- [22] Y. Liu, C. Fan, Y. Dai, X. Chen, P. Zhou, and L. Sun. Toward robust imperceptible perturbation against unauthorized text-to-image diffusion-based synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13127*, 3, 2023.
- [23] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [24] C. Meng, Y. He, Y. Song, J. Song, J. Wu, J.-Y. Zhu, and S. Ermon. Sedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [25] G. Mittal, J. Engel, C. Hawthorne, and I. Simon. Symbolic music generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.16091*, 2021.
- [26] W. Nie, B. Guo, Y. Huang, C. Xiao, A. Vahdat, and A. Anandkumar. Diffusion models for adversarial purification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.07460*, 2022.
- [27] X. Pan, P. Qin, Y. Li, H. Xue, and W. Chen. Synthesizing coherent story with auto-regressive latent diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10950*, 2022.
- [28] W. Peebles and S. Xie. Scalable diffusion models with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4195–4205, 2023.
- [29] S. Peng, Y. Chen, C. Wang, and X. Jia. Protecting the intellectual property of diffusion models by the watermark diffusion process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03436*, 2023.
- [30] B. Poole, A. Jain, J. T. Barron, and B. Mildenhall. Dreamfusion: Text-to-3d using 2d diffusion. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [31] T. Rahman, H.-Y. Lee, J. Ren, S. Tulyakov, S. Mahajan, and L. Sigal. Make-a-story: Visual memory conditioned consistent story generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2493–2502, 2023.
- [32] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10684–10695, 2022.
- [33] H. Salman, A. Khaddaj, G. Leclerc, A. Ilyas, and A. Madry. Raising the cost of malicious ai-powered image editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06588*, 2023.
- [34] C. Schuhmann, R. Beaumont, R. Vencu, C. Gordon, R. Wightman, M. Cherti, T. Coombes, A. Katta, C. Mullis, M. Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25278–25294, 2022.
- [35] R. Setty. Ai art generators hit with copyright suit over artists’ images. January 2023.
- [36] S. Shan, J. Cryan, E. Wenger, H. Zheng, R. Hanocka, and B. Y. Zhao. Glaze: Protecting artists from style mimicry by text-to-image models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04222*, 2023.
- [37] A. Shonenkov, M. Konstantinov, D. Bakshandaeva, C. Schuhmann, K. Ivanova, and N. Klokova. IF. <https://github.com/deep-floyd/IF>.
- [38] U. Singer, A. Polyak, T. Hayes, X. Yin, J. An, S. Zhang, Q. Hu, H. Yang, O. Ashual, O. Gafni, et al. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*, 2022.
- [39] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13456*, 2020.
- [40] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, and E. P. Simoncelli. Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 13(4):600–612, 2004.
- [41] H. Xue, C. Liang, X. Wu, and Y. Chen. Toward effective protection against diffusion-based mimicry through score distillation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [42] H. Xue, A. Araujo, B. Hu, and Y. Chen. Diffusion-based adversarial sample generation for improved stealthiness and controllability. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [43] C. Zhang, C. Zhang, M. Zhang, and I. S. Kweon. Text-to-image diffusion model in generative ai: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07909*, 2023.

- [44] E. Zhang, K. Wang, X. Xu, Z. Wang, and H. Shi. Forget-me-not: Learning to forget in text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17591*, 2023.
- [45] J. Zhang, Z. Xu, S. Cui, C. Meng, W. Wu, and M. R. Lyu. On the robustness of latent diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08257*, 2023.
- [46] R. Zhang, P. Isola, A. A. Efros, E. Shechtman, and O. Wang. The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 586–595, 2018.
- [47] Y. Zhao, T. Pang, C. Du, X. Yang, N.-M. Cheung, and M. Lin. A recipe for watermarking diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10137*, 2023.
- [48] Z. Zhao, J. Duan, K. Xu, C. Wang, R. Z. Z. D. Q. Guo, and X. Hu. Can protective perturbation safeguard personal data from being exploited by stable diffusion? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00084*, 2023.
- [49] B. Zheng, C. Liang, X. Wu, and Y. Liu. Understanding and improving adversarial attacks on latent diffusion model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04687*, 2023.