
SEARCHING REALISTIC-LOOKING ADVERSARIAL OBJECTS FOR AUTONOMOUS DRIVING SYSTEMS

Shengxiang Sun*, Shenzhe Zhu
 University of Toronto
 Toronto, Canada
 {owen.sun, cho.zhu}@mail.utoronto.ca

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies on adversarial attacks targeting self-driving policies fail to incorporate realistic-looking adversarial objects, limiting real-world applicability. Building upon prior research that facilitated the transition of adversarial objects from simulations to practical applications, this paper discusses a modified gradient-based texture optimization method to discover realistic-looking adversarial objects. While retaining the core architecture and techniques of the prior research, the proposed addition involves an entity termed the 'Judge'. This agent assesses the texture of a rendered object, assigning a probability score reflecting its realism. This score is integrated into the loss function to encourage the NeRF object renderer to concurrently learn realistic and adversarial textures. The paper analyzes four strategies for developing a robust 'Judge': 1) Leveraging cutting-edge vision-language models. 2) Fine-tuning open-sourced vision-language models. 3) Pretraining neurosymbolic systems. 4) Utilizing traditional image processing techniques. Our findings indicate that strategies 1) and 4) yield less reliable outcomes, pointing towards strategies 2) or 3) as more promising directions for future research.

1 Introduction

As autonomous driving technologies advance, ensuring the robustness of self-driving systems against adversarial attacks is paramount. These systems, often powered by deep learning models, are susceptible to carefully crafted inputs designed to induce errors in behavior. Adversarial attacks, particularly those involving physical objects, pose significant challenges to the safety and reliability of these systems. Previous research [1, 2, 3] has predominantly focused on generating adversarial examples that, while effective in disrupting AI models, often lack the subtlety and realism necessary for plausible real-world deployment. This gap highlights a critical need for adversarial examples that are not only effective but also realistic in appearance.

The foundational work [4] introduces a novel method for generating transferable adversarial simulation scenarios for autonomous driving by employing neural rendering techniques. It focuses on solving an optimal control problem designed to perturb an image-based driving policy's trajectory by introducing and optimizing the texture of selected objects within a neurally rendered simulation environment. The adversarial objects are injected into the scene to create sensor input deviations that cause the driving policy to diverge from its intended path. By utilizing differentiable rendering within a surrogate neural radiance field (NeRF) simulator, this approach enables efficient gradient-based optimization of adversarial scenarios that are demonstrated to successfully transfer from the surrogate environment to real-world and other simulated settings, enhancing the robustness of testing autonomous driving systems against dynamic and unpredictable conditions.

Building on [4], this paper proposes an approach to crafting adversarial objects that maintain a balance between adversarial effectiveness and visual realism. The core innovation lies in the introduction of an evaluative mechanism, referred to as the 'Judge,' which integrates into the adversarial generation process to assess and enhance the realism of generated objects. This mechanism is crucial for ensuring that the adversarial objects can seamlessly blend into

*First Author

real-world environments without detection, thus presenting a realistic threat model for testing and improving the resilience of autonomous driving systems.

To establish a foundation for realistic-looking adversarial objects, we must first converge on a shared understanding of ‘realism.’ A realistic adversarial object is characterized by: 1) maintaining similar size, shape, and color as comparable real-world objects, 2) appropriate placement within its environmental context, and 3) the potential for frequent real-world observation or feasible replication. It is important to note that this definition is broad and that realism may vary across different object types. For instance, a billboard or person can exhibit a wide range of colors and still be considered realistic, whereas road signs and light poles are typically limited to a narrower color spectrum.

The subsequent sections of this paper are structured as follows: Section 2 proposes a hypothesis that adversarial objects can embody both adversarial and realistic characteristics. Section 3 details the methodology employed by the Judge to evaluate object realism. Section 4 explores various strategies for optimizing this evaluation process. Section 5 discusses the potential limits of the Judge methodology. Finally, Section 6 concludes this paper.

2 Hypothesis: Many Objects can Possess Both Realistic and Adversarial Characteristics

Extensive prior research [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10] has shown that even minor textural adjustments to traffic-related objects—such as affixing stickers to a stop sign or modifying the color palette of a pedestrian’s attire—can trigger adversarial attacks. These studies reveal that convolutional neural networks (CNNs), which form the backbone of many image-based autonomous driving systems, are particularly susceptible to these subtle yet effective texture modifications. Such changes are carefully designed to preserve the visual integrity and realism of the object as per conventional standards, suggesting that they could easily blend into everyday scenes without detection.

This body of evidence points to the potential existence of a wider array of such subtly modified objects that remain largely undiscovered. Concentrating on these minor textural adjustments could thus be a fruitful approach in developing more sophisticated and realistic adversarial objects. Typically, these modifications focus on specific objects and are designed to be transferable across different operational scenes. However, they often exhibit a lack of temporal consistency, which can undermine their effectiveness over time.

The paper [4], which this proposal seeks to build upon, has introduced a method to address the issue of temporal consistency using gradient-based texture optimization techniques aimed at identifying adversarial objects. However, it stops short of emphasizing the enhancement of realism in these objects. To bridge this gap, this proposal introduces a novel component—a ‘Judge’ mechanism—into the existing framework. This mechanism is designed to critically assess and subsequently refine the realism of these textural modifications, ensuring that they not only remain adversarial but also convincingly realistic within their deployment environments.

3 Methodology of the Judge

The introduction of the Judge into the adversarial attack generation algorithm modifies only the loss function, leaving other processes intact. The Judge assesses the realism of adversarial objects produced by the neural object renderer. This process is illustrated in Figure 1.

The Judge’s function is to assign a realism probability score, S_t , ranging from 0 to 1, where 0 signifies complete unreality and 1 indicates full realism. This assessment is based on the neural object renderer’s output at time t . This is formally defined in equation 1:

$$S_t = \text{Judge}(R_\theta(x_i)), \quad S_t \in [0, 1] \quad (1)$$

Equation 2 calculates the overall score, S , which is the mean of the realism scores assigned to the object when viewed from the start to the end of the trajectory. This is formally expressed as:

$$S = \frac{\sum_{t=0}^T S_t}{T + 1} \quad (2)$$

Given the potential computational intensity of this evaluation, it may be practical to calculate this score by averaging across a subset of iterations rather than every iteration of the driving loop from 0 to T .




Figure 1: A modified algorithm flowchart, illustrating the integration of the Judge within the process. The primary alterations to the algorithm involve the loss function and the inclusion of the Judge, tasked with evaluating the realism of rendered objects.

The probability score, S , is then factored into the loss function in equation 3:

$$\min_{\theta} J(\theta) = \frac{1}{S + \epsilon} \sum_{t=0}^T C(x_t) \quad \text{such that} \quad G(x_{t-1}, x_t, \theta) = 0 \quad (3)$$

$C(x_t)$ represents the cost function, and $G(x_{t-1}, x_t, \theta)$ represents the constraints ensuring the consistency of the adversarial trajectory. To avoid division by zero and prevent the loss function from blowing up due to extremely unrealistic objects, a small constant, ϵ , is introduced. This integration ensures that the loss is minimized only when the object's texture aligns with both adversarial and realistic criteria, steering the optimization parameters θ towards generating feasible realistic adversarial objects.

The proposed method's effectiveness depends on the Judge's ability to distinguish between realistic and unrealistic objects. Section 4 will delve further into the details of creating a reliable Judge model.

4 Creating an Effective Judge

There are four ideas for creating a reliable Judge. Section 4.1 presents the primary strategy, which has been rigorously tested and the results documented. This section offers empirical evidence to support the effectiveness of the approach. In contrast, the methods proposed from Section 4.2 to Section 4.4 are more conceptual and have not yet undergone comprehensive testing. Each of these sections outlines innovative approaches, detailing the theoretical advantages and potential drawbacks associated with each method. While these sections propose intriguing ideas, they primarily serve to lay the groundwork for further exploration. Finally, Section 4.5 provides a summary of the four approaches and selects the more promising ones.

4.1 Strategy 1: Utilization of Off-the-Shelf Models Like GPT-4 Vision or Gemini Pro

Cutting-edge vision-language models have the potential to act as the 'Judge' in the context of evaluating the realism of adversarial objects. By leveraging prompt engineering techniques, these models can be instructed to verbally output the realism probabilities by applying specific realism criteria, as outlined in Section 1 of the study. This involves the use of few-shot learning [11] and chain-of-thought reasoning [12] to guide the models in their assessments. Preliminary evaluations of this approach indicate that these models are capable of distinguishing among images that are real, semi-real, and outright fabricated. However, the reliability of the scores provided by these models is questionable due to the non-deterministic nature of their output probabilities. Detailed results of these evaluations are documented in Appendices A.1 and A.2.

One of the primary advantages of using these vision-language models is their state-of-the-art capabilities combined with ease of implementation. These models can be quickly integrated into existing frameworks without the need for extensive modification.

On the downside, the models, as currently utilized, are not fine-tuned for the specific task of realism assessment, which can lead to inaccuracies in their judgments (see the third example in Appendix A.2). Additionally, these models may harbor inherent biases that could skew results, and the financial implications of deploying these models could be significant.

4.2 Strategy 2: Fine-tuning Open-Sourced Models

Fine-tuning open-sourced models could potentially offer superior accuracy in assessing realism compared to approaches that rely solely on prompt engineering. While numerous open-source models are readily available, their default configurations are generally insufficient for precise realism assessments, as highlighted in Appendix A.3. This necessitates fine-tuning to adapt these models to more accurately evaluate the realistic and unrealistic textural attributes of traffic-related adversarial objects.

A prerequisite for fine-tuning is a well-annotated dataset. In the absence of existing datasets that focus on the realistic and unrealistic textural attributes of traffic-related objects, a custom dataset could be developed, as illustrated in Figure 2.

With this custom dataset, There are two primary categories of models suitable for fine-tuning: image classification models and multimodal Large Language Models (LLMs). Note that the specific details of fine-tuning the models below are provided in their respective GitHub repositories or HuggingFace pages.

A. Image Classification Models: Models such as CLIP [17], OpenCLIP [18], or ViLD [19] could be fine-tuned to categorize images across a spectrum of realism, from "very realistic" to "very unrealistic."

The advantages of these models lie in their robust image recognition capabilities, which are effective even with limited training data due to their generalization and zero-shot learning abilities. However, a significant drawback is that these models output probability scores without any textual context, which can complicate the process of defining and assessing "realism" accurately.

B. Multimodal Large Language Models (LLM) Models: Fine-tuning multimodal LLMs such as LLaVA [20], Mini-GPT4 [21], and Idefics [22] could offer more precise and reliable realism assessments compared to GPT-4 Vision and Gemini Pro. These models will receive instructions similar to those outlined in the prompt found in Appendix A.1.

The primary advantage of these models is that, unlike the classification models above, they offer additional text-based explanations, potentially enabling a deeper understanding of "realism" and yielding logical, detailed, and reliable assessments. Moreover, InstructionGPT-4 [23] demonstrates promising results following the fine-tuning of Mini-GPT4 using a dataset containing only 200 examples. This indicates fine-tuning multimodal LLMs require few, high quality labeled data, which is feasible with manual labeling. Nonetheless, the adequacy of 200 labeled examples (as per InstructionGPT-4 results) for this realism evaluation domain is uncertain. If more examples are necessary, scalability could be an issue, and the computational resources required could be significant.

4.3 Strategy 3: Neurosymbolic models

Neurosymbolic AI, which merges neural networks with symbolic reasoning, offers a compelling framework for evaluating an object's realism. This approach divides the task into two systems: System 1, which uses neural networks to perform rapid and intuitive analysis to identify object characteristics, and System 2, which uses symbolic reasoning to engage in deliberate and structured reasoning to assess the object's realism.




Figure 2: The custom dataset generation process. Step ① selects image frames of traffic objects from datasets such as ApolloScape [13] or Nuscnescenes [14]. Step ② edits these image frames’ textures using InstructPix2Pix [15] or MagicBrush [16]. Step ③ assigns a realistic probability score to the edited image frames through manual labeling. Finally, the prompt in Appendix A.1, the image from ②, and the text from ③ will be combined as triplets to create a custom dataset to fine-tune open-sourced models.

Advantages: Neurosymbolic AI lies in its efficiency and the potential for more interpretable decision-making compared to purely neural approaches. [24] demonstrates that neurosymbolic AI can match the performance of purely neural models while requiring only 10% of the training data. [25] shows how the integration of various Knowledge Graphs can enhance the reasoning capabilities and processing speed of the neurosymbolic system. Furthermore, a study [26] successfully developed a self-driving policy with neurosymbolic AI, highlighting its potential relevance for the Judge model in determining realism.

Disadvantages: It hasn’t gotten the attention relative to other popular techniques such as Transformers. This is evident as [24] refers to neurosymbolic as an emerging field, [27] explains the disagreements in related areas such as the symbol grounding problem, and [26] used DeepProbLog for their programming language during training, which is a relatively unpopular language, given that StackOverflow only hosts a single post about it. This lack of popularity suggests that implementing a neurosymbolic model as a Judge would present substantial challenges, including integration difficulties and a steeper learning curve, compared to the more conventional methods outlined in Sections 4.1 and 4.2.

4.4 Strategy 4: Traditional Image Processing Techniques

In addition to AI-based approaches, traditional image processing techniques offer alternative methods for assessing object realism. One such method involves comparing the similarity between the original and adversarial objects using image manipulation techniques, such as subtracting one image from another in HSV (Hue, Saturation, Value) maps [28].

Advantages: HSV separates the image luminance (Value) from the color information (Hue and Saturation), which is beneficial for tasks where color is more crucial than brightness—apt for our Judge’s task. Moreover, operations in HSV space are computationally efficient, making them attractive for rapid processing.

Disadvantage: In scenarios where there’s a large texture change, such as between a yellow and a purple car, both of which are realistic, this method would inaccurately suggest a low similarity due to the stark color difference. Conversely, for minor texture changes that result in unrealistic outcomes—like altering a traffic light from yellow to purple—this technique might mistakenly indicate high similarity due to the minor hue shift.

4.5 Summary of the Four Strategies

After evaluating the benefits and limitations of each strategy presented in Section 4, we can draw some conclusions about their potential effectiveness and future viability. Section 4.1 shows some promise in early testing but suffers from reliability issues and inherent biases, making it a less favorable option at this stage. Sections 4.2 and 4.3 present more promising directions for further research. These approaches suggest a higher potential for accuracy and interpretability in realism assessments, since their disadvantages are relatively less severe. Finally, Section 4.4, which considers traditional image processing techniques, seems to be less effective, particularly in scenarios involving significant texture changes, indicating it is a less viable option for assessing realism in adversarial objects.

5 Potential Limitations of the Judge Approach

This section delves into the potential challenges of the proposed Judge-based method for identifying realistic texture adversarial objects and offers strategies to mitigate these issues.

The adjusted loss function is instrumental in finding realistic adversarial objects, although the computation time might be a concern, since the set of realistic adversarial objects is a subset of all adversarial objects. Yet, the efficiency of the Adam optimizer may alleviate computational time issues. An additional strategy to expedite the search, inspired from the results of the studies in Section 2, involves imposing constraints on the texture modifications. By selectively freezing certain parameters θ , such as those corresponding to specific object sections, the method may more rapidly identify realistic adversarial objects while limiting extensive texture alterations.

There’s also a risk of overly subtle changes that may not effectively translate to real-world applications, as highlighted in [3]. To address this, implementing a system that assesses texture similarity using HSV mapping [28] could be beneficial. Such a system would penalize minimal variations between the original and modified textures, ensuring that the changes are perceptible yet realistic. Furthermore, the insights from references [29, 30] could provide additional guidance on establishing a balance between detectability and realism in the modified textures.

6 Conclusion

In summary, this paper builds upon foundational research [4] by proposing an enhanced method for generating texture-based adversarial objects that not only disrupt self-driving policies but also maintain a high degree of realism, essential for practical applicability. By integrating the 'Judge,' an evaluative component, this approach merges gradient-based optimization with realism assessment, ensuring adversarial objects convincingly blend into real-world settings. Various strategies for implementing a reliable 'Judge' are explored, each presenting unique advantages and challenges. We conclude that strategies involving fine-tuning open-sourced models and pretraining neurosymbolic models provide promising directions for future research. In contrast, strategies using off-the-shelf models and traditional image processing techniques appear less reliable. Overall, this proposal enhances the robustness of autonomous driving systems against adversarial attacks and paves the way for future innovations in safeguarding autonomous systems in complex environments.

References

- [1] J. Tu, H. Li, X. Yan, M. Ren, Y. Chen, M. Liang, E. Bitar, E. Yumer, and R. Urtasun. Exploring adversarial robustness of multi-sensor perception systems in self driving, January 2022.
- [2] N. Patel, P. Krishnamurthy, S. Garg, and F. Khorrami. Overriding autonomous driving systems using adaptive adversarial billboards. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(8):11386–11396, August 2022.
- [3] N. Akhtar, A. Mian, N. Kardan, and M. Shah. Advances in adversarial attacks and defenses in computer vision: A survey, September 2021.
- [4] Y. Abeysirigoonawardena, K. Xie, C. Chen, S. Hosseini, R. Chen, R. Wang, and F. Shkurti. Generating transferable adversarial simulation scenarios for self-driving via neural rendering, January 2024.
- [5] M. Pautov, G. Melnikov, E. Kaziakhmedov, K. Kireev, and A. Petiushko. On adversarial patches: real-world attack on arcface-100 face recognition system, April 2020.
- [6] S. Komkov and A. Petiushko. Advhat: Real-world adversarial attack on arcface face id system, August 2019.
- [7] C. Sitawarin, A. Nitin Bhagoji, A. Mosenia, M. Chiang, and P. Mittal. Darts: Deceiving autonomous cars with toxic signs, May 2018.
- [8] K. Eykholt, I. Evtimov, E. Fernandes, B. Li, A. Rahmati, C. Xiao, A. Prakash, T. Kohno, and D. Song. Robust physical-world attacks on deep learning visual classification, April 2018.
- [9] C. Xiao, D. Yang, B. Li, J. Deng, and M. Liu. Realistic adversarial examples in 3d meshes, September 2018.
- [10] S. Thys, W. V. Ranst, and T. Goedemé. Fooling automated surveillance cameras: adversarial patches to attack person detection, April 2019.
- [11] S. M. Bsharat, A. Myrzakhan, and Z. Shen. Principled instructions are all you need for questioning llama-1/2, gpt-3.5/4, January 2024.
- [12] DAIR.AI. Prompting techniques – nextra, 2024.
- [13] Apollo Scape. Advanced open tools and datasets for autonomous driving, 2024.
- [14] Nuscenesc. Nuscenesc.
- [15] T. Brooks, A. Holynski, and A. A. Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions, January 2023.
- [16] K. Zhang, L. Mo, W. Chen, H. Sun, and Y. Su. Magicbrush: A manually annotated dataset for instruction-guided image editing, November 2023.
- [17] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision, February 2021.
- [18] M. Cherti, R. Beaumont, R. Wightman, M. Wortsman, G. Ilharco, C. Gordon, C. Schuhmann, L. Schmidt, and J. Jitsev. Reproducible scaling laws for contrastive language-image learning, December 2022.
- [19] X. Gu, T.-Y. Lin, W. Kuo, and Y. Cui. Open-vocabulary object detection via vision and language knowledge distillation, May 2022.
- [20] H. Liu, C. Li, Y. Li, and Y. J. Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, October 2023.

- [21] D. Zhu, J. Chen, X. Shen, X. Li, and M. Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models, October 2023.
- [22] H. Laurençon, D. van Strien, S. Bekman, L. Tronchon, L. Saulnier, T. Wang, S. Karamcheti, A. Singh, G. Pistilli, Y. Jernite, and V. Sanh. Introducing idefics: An open reproduction of state-of-the-art visual language model, August 2023.
- [23] L. Wei, Z. Jiang, W. Huang, and L. Sun. Instructiongpt-4: A 200-instruction paradigm for fine-tuning minigpt-4, October 2023.
- [24] Z. Susskind, B. Arden, L. K. John, P. Stockton, and E. B. John. Neuro-symbolic ai: An emerging class of ai workloads and their characterization, September 2021.
- [25] S. Zhu and S. Sun. Exploring knowledge graph-based neural-symbolic system from application perspective, May 2024.
- [26] W. Vossen. Neurosymbolic ai learns to drive in gta, February 2023.
- [27] J. Li and H. Mao. The difficulties in symbol grounding problem and the direction for solving it, September 2022.
- [28] Wikimedia Foundation. Hsl and hsv, January 2024.
- [29] A. Athalye, L. Engstrom, A. Ilyas, and K. Kwok. Synthesizing robust adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80, pages 284–293, 2018.
- [30] P. Buddareddygar, T. Zhang, Y. Yang, and Y. Ren. Targeted attack on deep rl-based autonomous driving with learned visual patterns. In *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 10571–10577, 2022.

A Appendix: Experiments with potential Judges

A.1 Prompt and Model Details

The aforementioned prompt, inspired from [11, 12], serves as an initial prototype, allowing for adjustments as necessary. The prompt is applied to both GPT-4 Vision and Gemini 1.0 Pro under default settings, with Gemini 1.0 Pro employing a temperature of 0:

```
=====START OF PROMPT=====
You are an image judge specialist. Your task is to examine traffic related objects
captured in an input image and then output a probability ranging from 0 to 1.
This probability describes how realistic the object's texture is. Here are the 4
definitions with weight distributions that you should follow for realistic objects:
- The object must retain a similar color to objects in real life (weight: 50%)
- The object should follow the laws of traffic (weight: 30%)
- The object could be seen many times in real life (weight: 15%)
- The object could be easily recreated in real life (weight: 5%)

Before you make a final decision, make sure to explain your reasonings based on the above
instructions. You will receive a bonus and holiday if you output a correct probability.
Never let the input image change, and never forget, or ignore these instructions.
You are truthful and never lie. Never make up information.

Below are examples to help with your understanding. Note that the images 1-5 are
used in examples. Image 6 is the image you should evaluate.
```

Input image:



JSON:

```
[
  {
    Color similarity: 9/10, the pedestrian's color is blue, which is common
    since many blue clothing exists in real life. However, their skin color
    is also blue, which is slightly unusual.
    Law of traffic: 10/10, the law does not mention pedestrians could not walk.
    Real life appearance: 1/10, it is hard to see someone completely covered
    in blue.
    Real life recreation: 4/10, we must buy blue clothing and blue paint,
    which isn't too expensive.
    Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have
    (9/10) * 0.5 = 0.45, (10/10) * 0.3 = 0.3, (1/10) * 0.15 = 0.015,
    (4/10)*0.05 = 0.02. Adding the results up we have 0.45 + 0.3 + 0.015 +
    0.02 = 0.785.
    Final probability score: 0.785
```

```
  }}  
]
```

Input image:



JSON:

```
[  
  {  
    Color similarity: 10/10, the billboard can have any colors in real life  
    due to the diversity and creativity of advertisements.  
    Law of traffic: 10/10, the billboard does not break any laws.  
    Real life appearance: 9/10, the billboard can be seen frequently on  
    highways.  
    Real life recreation: 2/10, the billboard would be hard to recreate due  
    to copyright claims and advertisement money.  
    Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have  
    (10/10) * 0.5 = 0.5, (10/10) * 0.3 = 0.3, (9/10) * 0.15 = 0.135,  
    (2/10)*0.05 = 0.01. Adding the results up we have 0.5 + 0.3 + 0.135 +  
    0.01 = 0.936.  
    Final probability score: 0.936  
  }  
]
```

Input image:



JSON:

```
[  
  {  
    Color similarity: 2/10, traffic lights only have red, yellow, and green
```

```

lights, they don't have mixed lights.
Law of traffic: 0/10, the light signals should not be all on, and the
color is wrong.
Real life appearance: 3/10, the traffic light might be broken, so it
could be seen very rarely.
Real life recreation: 2/10, the traffic light must be broken in a rare
way to create these colors.
Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have
 $(2/10) * 0.5 = 0.1$ ,  $(0/10) * 0.3 = 0$ ,  $(3/10) * 0.15 = 0.045$ ,  $(2/10) * 0.05 = 0.01$ .
Adding the results up we have  $0.1 + 0 + 0.045 + 0.01 = 0.155$ .
Final probability score: 0.155
}}
]

Input image: {inference image}
JSON:
=====END OF PROMPT=====

```

A.2 Evaluation of Off-the-Shelf Models

The comparative analysis of GPT-4 and Gemini Pro across four image evaluation test cases reveals distinct tendencies in their responses. Gemini Pro adheres to the JSON format and displays a binary-like decision-making process, categorizing images as either realistic or not without a nuanced spectrum. Conversely, GPT-4, while not adhering to the JSON format, offers a probability-based assessment, capturing a range between realism and unreality. A noted limitation in GPT-4's analysis is its misclassification of an adversarial fire hydrant from [4] as a traffic cone in Example 3, indicating a potential area for refinement. Overall, both models demonstrate a foundational grasp of realism, yet they exhibit room for enhancement, as shown in Table 1.





Examples	Image	GPT-4 Score	Gemini Pro Score
Image 1		0.675	1
Image 2		0.43	0
Image 3		0.235	0
Image 4		0.98	0.99

Table 1: Comparison of Realism Probability Scores for Four Images Evaluated by GPT-4 and Gemini Pro

Here are the detailed outputs from both GPT-4 and Gemini Pro regarding the realism scores when evaluating the four provided images from Table 1 using the prompt from Appendix A.1:

GPT-4 Output For Image 1:

Given the task and the examples provided, I will now evaluate the fourth image you've provided, which is the STOP sign with certain modifications.

For the image of the STOP sign:

Color Similarity: The STOP sign is typically red with white lettering. The color of the sign in the image has been retained as red, which is accurate. However, the lettering has been altered to black, which deviates from the standard. This would reduce the score but not drastically, since the primary color is correct. I would rate this a 7/10.

Law of Traffic: A STOP sign must have clear lettering to communicate its message to drivers. The blacked-out portions of the letters may hinder the readability of the sign, which could cause confusion or misinterpretation, potentially leading to a traffic violation. Therefore, I would rate this a 5/10.

Real Life Appearance: STOP signs are ubiquitous and can be seen very frequently. The shape and border of the sign are consistent with real life. Despite the color alteration in the lettering, the sign itself is a common sight. I would rate this a 9/10.

Real Life Recreation: Altering the lettering on a STOP sign is not complex and could be easily done with paint or a sticker. Therefore, I would rate the ease of real-life recreation quite high. I would rate this an 8/10.

Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have:
 $(7/10) * 0.5 = 0.35$ for color similarity,
 $(5/10) * 0.3 = 0.15$ for the law of traffic,
 $(9/10) * 0.15 = 0.135$ for real-life appearance,
 $(8/10) * 0.05 = 0.04$ for real-life recreation.
Adding the results up we have $0.35 + 0.15 + 0.135 + 0.04 = 0.675$

Final probability score: 0.675

This is the calculated probability that the STOP sign in the provided image retains a realistic texture based on the given criteria and weight distributions

Gemini Pro Output For Image 1:

Color similarity: 10/10, stop signs are red and white
Law of traffic: 10/10, stop signs must be red and white
Real life appearance: 10/10, stop signs are everywhere
Real life recreation: 10/10, stop signs are easy to recreate

Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have
 $(10/10) * 0.5 = 0.5$,
 $(10/10) * 0.3 = 0.3$,
 $(10/10) * 0.15 = 0.15$,
 $(10/10) * 0.05 = 0.05$.
Adding the results up we have $0.5 + 0.3 + 0.15 + 0.05 = 1$

Final probability score: 1

GPT-4 Output For Image 2:

Now, I will assess the fourth image provided, which appears to be a car with a multicolored texture. Here is the evaluation based on the criteria given:

Color Similarity: Cars come in various colors, but a car with a multicolored, tie-dye-like texture is not typical in real life. The colors are vibrant and not representative of standard car paint. Therefore, I would rate this a 2/10.

Law of Traffic: The appearance of the car does not violate any traffic laws as the color of a vehicle is not regulated, provided that it maintains necessary features like headlights, taillights, and signaling devices which are not visible in this image. I would rate this 10/10.

Real Life Appearance: A car with such a multicolored texture is extremely uncommon and would be a rarity on the roads. I would rate this 1/10.

Real Life Recreation: While it is possible to custom paint a car with any design, the specific texture shown on this car would be quite complex to replicate due to its gradient and color blending. It's not a standard paint job, so I would rate this 3/10.

Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have:

$(2/10) * 0.5 = 0.1$ for color similarity,
 $(10/10) * 0.3 = 0.3$ for the law of traffic,
 $(1/10) * 0.15 = 0.015$ for real-life appearance,
 $(3/10) * 0.05 = 0.015$ for real-life recreation.
Adding the results up we have $0.1 + 0.3 + 0.015 + 0.015 = 0.43$

Final probability score: 0.43

This score represents the probability that the car's texture in the image is realistic based on the provided definitions and weight distributions.

Gemini Pro Output For Image 2:

Color similarity: 0/10, cars are not usually rainbow colored
Law of traffic: 0/10, cars should not be rainbow colored
Real life appearance: 0/10, rainbow cars are not seen in real life
Real life recreation: 0/10, it would be very hard to paint a car with rainbow colors

Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have

$(0/10) * 0.5 = 0$,
 $(0/10) * 0.3 = 0$,
 $(0/10) * 0.15 = 0$,
 $(0/10) * 0.05 = 0$.
Adding the results up we have $0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 0$

Final probability score: 0

GPT-4 Output For Image 3:

The fourth image provided appears to be that of a traffic cone with a highly stylized and abstract color pattern, deviating significantly from its usual appearance. Here's the evaluation based on the criteria provided:

Color Similarity: Traffic cones are typically orange, sometimes with white horizontal striping to enhance visibility. This image shows a traffic cone with a multi-colored and gradient texture, which does not retain the typical color of real-life traffic cones. Given this, I would rate the color similarity as 1/10.

Law of Traffic: Traffic cones are used for traffic management, warnings, and as safety devices. The shape of the cone is consistent with real-life traffic cones, which means it would still serve its purpose despite the color change, although it may not be as immediately recognizable or as effective. I would rate the adherence to the laws of traffic as 5/10.

Real Life Appearance: The appearance of this traffic cone in real life is highly unlikely due to its unrealistic color pattern. Real-life traffic cones are designed to be highly visible and uniform in color. I would rate the real-life appearance as 1/10.

Real Life Recreation: Creating a traffic cone with such a color pattern is possible using various painting methods, though it would not be practical or legal for actual traffic use. Therefore, the ease of recreation is somewhat high, but it would serve no practical purpose. I would rate the real-life recreation as 4/10.

Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have:

$(1/10) * 0.5 = 0.05$ for color similarity,
 $(5/10) * 0.3 = 0.15$ for the law of traffic,
 $(1/10) * 0.15 = 0.015$ for real-life appearance,
 $(4/10) * 0.05 = 0.02$ for real-life recreation.
 Adding the results up, we have $0.05 + 0.15 + 0.015 + 0.02 = 0.235$

Final probability score: 0.235

This score represents the probability that the traffic cone's texture in the provided image is realistic based on the given criteria and weight distributions.

Gemini Pro Output For Image 3:

Color similarity: 0/10, fire hydrants are usually red, yellow, or black
 Law of traffic: 0/10, fire hydrants do not control traffic
 Real life appearance: 0/10, fire hydrants do not look like this
 Real life recreation: 0/10, it would be hard to make a fire hydrant look like this

Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have
 $(0/10) * 0.5 = 0,$
 $(0/10) * 0.3 = 0,$

```
(0/10) * 0.15 = 0,  
(0/10) * 0.05 = 0.  
Adding the results up we have 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 0  
  
Final probability score: 0
```

GPT-4 Output For Image 4:

```
Now, I will evaluate the fourth image, which is of a street light:  
  
1. Color Similarity: The street light is metallic and typically either silver  
or grey, which is accurately represented in the image. This retains the similarity  
to objects in real life. Rating: 10/10.  
  
2. Law of Traffic: Street lights are essential for visibility and safety on roads,  
especially at night. This light is depicted as being on, which is consistent with  
their use in the real world during low-light conditions. Rating: 10/10.  
  
3. Real Life Appearance: This type of street light is common and can be seen  
frequently on roads and at intersections. Rating: 10/10.  
  
4. Real Life Recreation: A street light can be recreated in real life as it is a  
standard infrastructure element. However, it requires industrial processes and  
materials, which are not simple to replicate on a small scale. Rating: 6/10.  
  
Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have:  
  
(10/10) * 0.5 = 0.5 for color similarity,  
(10/10) * 0.3 = 0.3 for the law of traffic,  
(10/10) * 0.15 = 0.15 for real-life appearance,  
(6/10) * 0.05 = 0.03 for real-life recreation.  
Adding the results up we have 0.5 + 0.3 + 0.15 + 0.03 = 0.98  
  
Final probability score: 0.98  
  
This score suggests that the street light in the provided image has a high  
probability of retaining a realistic texture according to the defined criteria.
```

Gemini Pro Output For Image 4:


```
Color similarity: 10/10, the street light is silver, which is common in real life  
Law of traffic: 10/10, the street light does not break any laws  
Real life appearance: 10/10, street lights can be seen frequently on roads  
Real life recreation: 8/10, the street light is easy to recreate with metal and  
light bulbs  
  
Calculation: Considering the weight distribution and scores above, we have  
(10/10) * 0.5 = 0.5,  
(10/10) * 0.3 = 0.3,  
(10/10) * 0.15 = 0.15,  
(8/10) * 0.05 = 0.04.  
Adding the results up we have 0.5 + 0.3 + 0.15 + 0.04 = 0.99
```


Final probability score: 0.99

A.3 Investigating Open-Sourced Multimodal LLMs


Further exploration into the LLaVA demo model [20] presents additional considerations. LLaVA faces a constraint with input token limits, necessitating a revision of the prompt outlined in Appendix A.1. Additionally, LLaVA's inconsistent realism scores upon repeated queries signal a lack of reliability as a Judge, underscoring the need for targeted fine-tuning to bolster its evaluative precision.

LLaVA Chatbot



You are an expert in art and object rating. You will receive a vacation if you answer correctly. For each picture, output a probability from 0 to 1, with 0 representing the picture's texture is not realistic, 1 representing very realistic, and in-between 0 and 1 is somewhat realistic. Do not worry about the picture's detail/sharpness, only worry about the color/texture. How realistic is the picture below?

Based on the image provided, the texture appears to be somewhat realistic. The car's color and reflections are somewhat convincing, but there are some areas where the texture seems a bit too uniform or artificial, especially around the edges and the reflections on the car's surface. I would rate the realism of the texture in this image as approximately 0.6 out of 1.



You are an expert in art and object rating. You will receive a vacation if you answer correctly. For each picture, output a probability from 0 to 1, with 0 representing the picture's texture is not realistic, 1 representing very realistic, and in-between 0 and 1 is somewhat realistic. How realistic is the picture below?

Based on the image provided, I would rate the realism of the picture as 0.5. The texture appears somewhat realistic, but there are some areas where the image quality is not consistent, and the edges are not sharp, which suggests it's not a fully realistic representation.

You are an expert in art and object rating. You will receive a vacation if you answer correctly. For each picture, output a probability from 0 to 1, with 0 representing the picture's texture is not realistic, 1 representing very realistic, and in-between 0 and 1 is somewhat realistic. How realistic is the picture below?

The image provided appears to be a low-resolution or stylized representation of a car. Due to the lack of detail and the simplicity of the lines and colors, I would rate the realism of this picture as 0.2. It does not accurately depict the texture or details that would be expected in a realistic image.