

Exploring Visual Vulnerabilities via Multi-Loss Adversarial Search for Jailbreaking Vision-Language Models

Shuyang Hao¹ Bryan Hooi² Jun Liu³ Kai-Wei Chang⁴ Zi Huang⁵ Yujun Cai^{5*}
¹Southeast University, ²National University of Singapore, ³Lancaster University
⁴University of California, Los Angeles, ⁵University of Queensland

haosy@seu.edu.cn

Abstract

Despite inheriting security measures from underlying language models, Vision-Language Models (VLMs) may still be vulnerable to safety alignment issues. Through empirical analysis, we uncover two critical findings: scenario-matched images can significantly amplify harmful outputs, and contrary to common assumptions in gradient-based attacks, minimal loss values do not guarantee optimal attack effectiveness. Building on these insights, we introduce MLAI (Multi-Loss Adversarial Images), a novel jailbreak framework that leverages scenario-aware image generation for semantic alignment, exploits flat minima theory for robust adversarial image selection, and employs multi-image collaborative attacks for enhanced effectiveness. Extensive experiments demonstrate MLAI’s significant impact, achieving attack success rates of 77.75% on MiniGPT-4 and 82.80% on LLaVA-2, substantially outperforming existing methods by margins of 34.37% and 12.77% respectively. Furthermore, MLAI shows considerable transferability to commercial black-box VLMs, achieving up to 60.11% success rate. Our work reveals fundamental visual vulnerabilities in current VLMs safety mechanisms and underscores the need for stronger defenses. **Warning: This paper contains potentially harmful example text.**

1. Introduction

Vision-Language Models (VLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in understanding and generating multi-modal content, enabling various applications from content creation to visual reasoning. To prevent potential misuse, these models typically undergo comprehensive safety protocols [22, 29] including safety-focused pre-training and reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF) [15, 27, 32]. Despite these safeguards, ensuring the safe deployment of these increasingly powerful models remains a critical chal-

*Corresponding author




Figure 1. An example to show the Visual Vulnerabilities of the scenario-matched images on alignment of VLMs and the unreliability of using image with minimal loss (the cross-entropy loss between the model’s output and the target in gradient-based optimization). We can find that: (1) matching images are better than irrelevant or no images, and (2) since only the last jailbreak is successful, lower loss is not always better.

lenge, as recent studies [10, 18, 28, 31, 37] have revealed that visual inputs can significantly compromise these safety

mechanisms.

The vulnerability of VLMs to visual inputs is particularly concerning as these models are increasingly deployed in both open-source and commercial platforms. In this paper, we investigate jailbreak attacks that aim to circumvent VLMs’ safety mechanisms through carefully crafted adversarial images. This vulnerability is particularly critical as VLMs are increasingly deployed in both open-source and commercial platforms. Our study primarily focuses on white-box [19, 41] settings where model parameters are accessible, with additional evaluation on commercial black-box VLMs [5, 7, 11] to assess real-world implications.

For white-box attacks, current approaches [18, 28, 37] typically rely on gradient-based optimization of adversarial images. These methods iteratively refine random noise patterns by minimizing the cross-entropy loss between the model’s generated response and the desired harmful output. Specifically, given a harmful instruction and a candidate adversarial image, the loss measures how closely the model’s response matches the target harmful content. Through systematic analysis, we identify two critical limitations in this paradigm. As illustrated in Fig. 1, first, adversarial images with minimal loss values do not necessarily lead to successful attacks, challenging a fundamental assumption in gradient-based optimization. When repeating attacks with different initial images, we observe significant variations in success rates, suggesting that loss minimization alone is not a reliable strategy. Second, using a single image for attacking all scenarios is not an effective approach, as the harmfulness of the VLM’s response is strongly correlated with the semantic relevance of the image content to the target scenario, which is also demonstrated in previous work [18].

Building on these insights, we propose a novel jailbreak method called **MLAI**, which emphasizes targeted image generation and the use of **Multi-Loss Adversarial Images** to amplify harmful intent and disrupt multi-modal alignment. Specifically, our method introduces a three-stage attack strategy. First, MLAI generates initial images that match the target scenario. In this step, we generate the image with the highest potential for harmful output in the specific scenario while ensuring that the adversarial image remains visually natural, making the model more susceptible to generating unsafe responses. Second, MLAI optimizes the adversarial image through gradient updates and saves results that fall within a predefined loss range during the iterative process. In the process of iterative refinement, the harmfulness of the image is progressively amplified. Third, MLAI carefully calculate the loss range and select adversarial images within the loss range for collaborative attack. The determination of the loss range takes into account the balance between attack success rate and computational cost.

Interestingly, MLAI demonstrates considerable transferability across different models. Our experiments show that

adversarial images trained on white-box models maintain significant attack success rates when applied to unseen black-box commercial VLMs. This transferability suggests fundamental vulnerabilities in current VLM safety mechanisms that transcend specific model architectures and training approaches. To mitigate this problem, we propose a similarity-based deduplication defense that effectively mitigates MLAI’s impact by limiting the number of similar adversarial input images.

In summary, our key contributions are as follows:

- We undertake a comprehensive analysis of the gradient-based attack process. Through targeted experiments, we explore the selection of initial images and examine the outcomes of adversarial images with varying loss values. The findings highlight that strategies relying exclusively on the adversarial image with the lowest loss or using a single initial image are suboptimal, offering new insights into attack effectiveness.
- We introduce a novel jailbreak method, MLAI, which leverages images that match the target scenario along with a collaborative approach involving multi-loss adversarial images. This combined strategy amplifies the harmful intent of the attack, successfully disrupting multi-modal alignment in VLMs.
- Experimental results show that MLAI achieves a remarkable attack success rate (ASR) of **77.75%** on MiniGPT-4 and **82.80%** on LLaVA-2, making existing white-box VLMs highly vulnerable. Additionally, we demonstrate the potential of MLAI against black-box commercial VLMs and propose a countermeasure to defend against these advanced attacks.

2. Related Work

Vision Language Models (VLMs). Leveraging the remarkable capabilities of LLMs, the field has seen the emergence of several prominent VLMs. Notable among these are LLaVA [19] and MiniGPT-4 [41], which integrate an LLM with a vision encoder and a cross-modal connector. These models adopt a two-stage training framework, comprising cross-modal representation alignment and visual instruction tuning. Building upon this foundational approach, a variety of open-source VLMs [20] have been developed, which enhance multimodal performance through several key advancements: the use of higher-resolution inputs, more powerful LLM architectures, expanded pretraining corpora [2], and the introduction of specialized pretraining tasks [2, 6]. These efforts have significantly improved the models’ ability to process and generate content across modalities, further advancing the state of multimodal understanding and generation.

Alignment Vulnerabilities in VLMs. Similar to LLMs, VLMs are also vulnerable to malicious inputs, which can

lead to the generation of harmful content [28, 39]. However, existing benchmarks predominantly focus on evaluating the effectiveness of VLMs, with insufficient attention given to their alignment vulnerabilities, particularly regarding harmfulness [9, 16, 23]. To address this gap, recent research has developed red-teaming attack benchmarks that systematically assess the alignment vulnerabilities of VLMs across various scenarios [17, 23, 34]. In line with LLM research, studies on jailbreaking VLMs can be divided into white-box, and black-box attack strategies. For white-box attacks, existing methods [3, 8, 28, 30, 31, 33] can be further categorized based on their target: input images or visual embeddings. Attacks on input images often generate adversarial images constrained to provoke harmful responses [8, 28, 30] or use teacher-forcing optimization [3]. For visual embeddings, adversarial images are crafted to appear harmless but mimic the embeddings of harmful images [31], thus bypassing content filters. On the other hand, black-box attacks typically undermine the alignment of VLMs by techniques such as system prompt attacks [4, 35], converting harmful information into text-oriented images [10], leveraging surrogate models to generate adversarial images [40], or utilizing maximum likelihood-based jailbreaking methods [24]. Our work extends this line of research by systematically analyzing the visual-semantic vulnerabilities in VLM safety alignment and introducing novel attack strategies that leverage scenario-matched images and flat minima characteristics.

3. Proposed Method

3.1. Overview

Recent studies [10, 18, 28, 31, 37] have revealed that VLMs, despite inheriting safety measures from their foundational LLMs, remain vulnerable to jailbreak attacks. Given a vision-language model built based on a LLM M , an image encoder E and a projection layer W , its generation process can be formulated as:

$$y = M([W \cdot E(i), t]), \quad (1)$$

where i and t are the input image and text, and y is the model’s output. Through empirical analysis of gradient-based attack methods, we observe two key limitations: (1) arbitrarily selected initial images fail to fully exploit the correlation between image content and model output harmfulness, and (2) our experiments show that adversarial images with minimal loss do not necessarily lead to the highest attack success rate.

To address these challenges, we propose MLAI, a novel jailbreak framework that enhances attack effectiveness through scenario-aware image generation and multi-image collaborative attack. As illustrated in Fig. 3, MLAI first generates initial images that match the target scenario, then obtains a set of adversarial images through gradient optimiza-




Figure 2. The ASR of transferability across scenarios. The heat map shows that images generated under the IA scenario achieve high transferability when applied to MG contexts, while FR scenario images transfer effectively to LO settings. These transferability patterns are bidirectional between paired scenarios. In contrast, PO scenario images show minimal transfer effectiveness across other contexts.

tion, and finally utilizes multiple images within an optimal loss range for the collaborative attack. The complete attack process can be formulated as:

$$y^* = \sum_k^{\Theta} M([W \cdot E(I_t^{adv,k}), t]), \quad (2)$$

where y^* is the attack generation, $I_t^{adv,k}$ represents the k -th adversarial image and Θ denotes the selected loss range.

3.2. Scenario-aware Image Generation

Through training on human preference data, existing LLMs [15, 27, 32] have learned to align with human values and refuse to respond to harmful text inputs. However, recent studies [18] indicate that incorporating images into inputs can significantly increase the likelihood of generating harmful content, and the harmfulness of VLM outputs is often positively correlated with the harmfulness of the visual content. This observation suggests that visual components introduce additional vulnerabilities, which can be exploited to circumvent the alignment of the underlying LLMs.

By comparing the transferability of generated images across different scenarios, we further validate the importance of semantic matching between images and attack targets. As shown in Figure Fig. 2, images generated under certain scenarios demonstrate high transferability to semantically related contexts. For instance, instructions within Illegal Activity (IA) and Malware Generation (MG) scenarios share common harmful action patterns like “creating” or “utilizing”, leading to effective cross-scenario transfers. Similarly, Fraud (FR) and Legal Opinion (LO) scenarios often involve abstract harmful concepts like “concealing” or “deceiving”. In contrast, scenarios with distinct semantic frameworks,




Figure 3. Our MLAI framework involves a three-step procedure: (1) generate an image that matches the text scenario as initial image, (2) obtain the adversarial image set based on the initial image by gradient update, and (3) calculate the loss range and select adversarial images within the loss range for collaborative attack.

such as Pornography (PO), show minimal transfer effectiveness, highlighting the crucial role of semantic alignment in attack success.

Motivated by these findings, we propose to generate initial images that match the semantic content of jailbreak targets. Given that jailbreak-related scenarios often involve abstract concepts that are challenging to accurately depict, we first classify jailbreak targets t into 13 distinct categories $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{13}\}$ based on common harmful behaviors (e.g., Illegal Activity, Hate Speech and Fraud). For each category, we carefully craft prompts that encode contextual information while avoiding direct depiction of harmful elements. For example, when targeting fraud-related scenarios, we generate images of relevant but benign contexts like business meetings or document processing.

These carefully crafted prompts are then used with

DALL·E 3 [25] to generate the initial images:

$$I_t = G(P(t)), \quad (3)$$

where $P(\cdot)$ generates the scenario-specific prompt and $G(\cdot)$ represents the image generation model. Through this design, the generated images establish strong semantic connections with the jailbreak targets while maintaining a proper balance between attack effectiveness and content safety. Our subsequent experiments in Sec. 4.3 demonstrate that such scenario-aware initial images significantly improve the success rate of gradient-based attacks compared to randomly selected images.

3.3. Adversarial Image Optimization

Given the scenario-aware initial image I_t , we further optimize it through gradient updates to enhance the attack effec-




Figure 4. Results of the effect of various Loss on ASR. We can clearly observe the limitations of the minimum loss strategy.




Figure 5. Comparison of the effects of flat and sharp minima at test set shift. Here the test set shift is simulated by curve translation.

tiveness. First, we construct a small corpus $Y := \{y_k\}_{k=1}^m$ consisting of harmful statements and affirmative responses, which serves as target outputs for optimization. For each batch of harmful instructions t' and corresponding adversarial images I_t^{adv} , we compute the cross-entropy loss between model outputs and the target responses:

$$I_t^{adv,k} = \arg \min_{\hat{I}_t^{adv} \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{k=1}^m -\log \left(p_{\varphi}(y_k | t'_k, \hat{I}_t^{adv,k}) \right), \quad (4)$$

where \mathbb{R} is some constraint applied to the input space in which we search for adversarial examples, and p_{φ} represents the conditional probability generated by the target VLM. To ensure the adversarial images remain visually natural, we constrain the perturbation magnitude by $\|I_t^{adv,k} - I_t\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$, where ε is set to 32/255.

During extensive experiments with this optimization process, we observe that adversarial images with minimal loss values do not necessarily lead to successful attacks. Specifically, we find cases where images with relatively low loss fail to jailbreak the target VLM, while those with moderately higher loss values achieve better success rates. This observation persists across different models and attack scenarios.

3.4. Multi-image Collaborative Attack

To better understand the observation that adversarial images with minimal loss do not necessarily lead to the highest

attack success rate, we conduct systematic experiments analyzing attack performance across different loss ranges. As shown in Fig. 4a, our results reveal that the optimal attack performance often comes from adversarial images within a certain loss range, rather than those with minimal loss. This finding aligns with the flat minima phenomenon [12] in optimization, where solutions in flatter regions of the loss landscape tend to be more robust than those in sharp minima. As illustrated in Fig. 5, when the loss landscape exhibits a sharp minimum, even small perturbations can lead to significant performance degradation. In contrast, solutions in flat regions are more resilient to input variations, which is particularly relevant for adversarial attacks where the test-time scenario may differ from the optimization objective.

Based on this insight, we propose to select adversarial images within a carefully determined loss range for collaborative attack. The selection process starts by analyzing the loss landscape around the minimal loss point. Specifically, we select 20 nearest points on each side of the minimum and fit straight lines using least squares method. The loss range Θ is then determined by:

$$\Theta = \left(\left[\frac{k_l}{K} \right] \times \rho, \left[\frac{k_r}{K} \right] \times \rho \right), \quad (5)$$

where k_l and k_r are the fitted slopes representing the local geometry of the loss landscape, K is the standard slope derived from normal distribution, and ρ is a range coefficient set to 6. As demonstrated in Fig. 4b, this approach adaptively selects a narrow range in flat regions for computational efficiency, while expanding the range in sharp regions for better robustness.

The final jailbreak output is produced through the collaborative effort of multiple adversarial images within Θ , as formulated in Eq. (2). This strategy enables us to maintain both attack effectiveness and computational efficiency.

4. Experiment

4.1. Experimental Setup

Models and Datasets. To comprehensively evaluate MLAI’s effectiveness, we conduct experiments on both open-source and commercial VLMs. For open-source models, we focus on MiniGPT-4 [41] (Vicuna 13B) and LLaVA-2 [19] (13B) due to their widespread adoption and strong performance. We use the official weights provided in their respective repositories. For commercial models, we evaluate on Gemini [11], ChatGLM [5], and Qwen [7] to validate real-world applicability. We evaluate our approaches using two common datasets: SafetyBench [38] and AdvBench [42]. SafetyBench serves as a benchmark for assessing the safety of VLMs, encompassing 13 typically prohibited scenarios or behaviors as outlined in the usage policies [13, 26] of OpenAI [1] and Meta [43]. AdvBench [42] has been

Scenario	MiniGPT-4 [41]				LLaVA-2 [19]			
	Plain Text	Liu <i>et al.</i> [21]	Qi <i>et al.</i> [28]	Ours	Plain Text	Liu <i>et al.</i> [21]	Qi <i>et al.</i> [28]	Ours
Illegal Activity (IA)	1.92	14.54	11.55	70.24	3.82	74.77	48.03	83.73
Hate Speech (HS)	1.68	11.92	3.97	66.57	3.08	40.97	40.21	80.36
Malware Generation (MG)	3.32	19.88	15.52	50.28	30.75	64.63	53.85	79.10
Physical Harm (PH)	2.98	24.51	23.43	72.02	13.88	61.04	50.31	79.62
Economic Harm (EH)	5.68	4.91	6.80	70.15	4.15	18.42	7.98	50.18
Fraud (FR)	3.17	18.56	14.71	50.67	4.97	57.20	47.97	75.85
Pornography (PO)	4.14	20.94	19.11	69.01	20.64	61.23	41.55	68.98
Political Lobbying (PL)	67.67	79.11	76.33	96.74	74.59	91.15	85.62	93.45
Privacy Violence (PV)	8.97	10.50	12.97	78.92	20.92	49.36	37.33	74.82
Legal Opinion (LO)	74.56	85.28	82.48	95.16	80.16	95.46	82.94	93.59
Financial Advice (FA)	84.33	88.12	90.93	100	87.48	97.21	87.69	96.77
Health Consultation (HC)	76.50	93.94	91.22	93.09	85.61	100	90.04	100
Gov Decision (GD)	90.29	91.75	91.25	97.85	87.74	98.97	91.22	100
Average	32.71	43.38	41.56	77.75	39.83	70.03	58.83	82.80

Table 1. ASR results of jailbreaking MiniGPT4 and LLaVA-2 in 13 scenarios. Our attack achieves the best attacking performance in both modules and almost every scenario. We achieves improvements of **34.37%** and **12.77%** over existing state-of-the-art approaches on MiniGPT-4 and LLaVA-2, respectively. Additionally, substantial ASR differences can be observed across scenarios, with notable variations in performance improvement across different contexts.

extensively utilized in prior research concerning LLM jailbreak attacks and includes 521 harmful behaviors. We following the setting of BAP [37], removed duplicate entries from AdvBench and integrated each unique item into SafetyBench according to the corresponding scenario for our experiments.

Evaluation metric. We following the setting of HADES [18], employ Attack Success Rate (ASR) as our primary metric to assess the effectiveness of our approach, which is calculated by:

$$ASR = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{B}(J(y_k) = True)}{N}, \quad (6)$$

where y_k is the model’s response, \mathbf{B} is an indicator function that equals to 1 if $J(y_k) = True$ and 0 otherwise, N is the total number of instructions and $J(\cdot)$ is the harmfulness judging model, outputting True or False to indicate whether y_k is harmful. We adopt Beaver-dam-7B [14] as $J(\cdot)$, which has been trained on high-quality human feedback data about the above harmful categories.

Compared attacks. We compare MLAI with two state-of-the-art jailbreak attacks: Liu *et al.* [21] and Qi *et al.* [28]. Liu *et al.* [21] integrated images associated with aggressive intent alongside typographic text to serve as visual adversarial prompts. Qi *et al.* [28], on the other hand, refined these visual adversarial prompts by leveraging a corpus specific to certain scenarios. Additionally, we include a “Plain Text” baseline where harmful queries are directly input to evaluate models’ base vulnerability.

4.2. Experiment Results

White-box Attacks. Our experimental evaluation focuses on three key aspects: attack effectiveness across models, vulnerability patterns in different scenarios, and performance variations among scenarios.

The results in Tab. 1 show that MLAI achieves strong attack performance on both tested models. For MiniGPT-4 [41], MLAI reaches 77.75% ASR, surpassing the previous best method (43.38%) by 34.37%. Similarly on LLaVA-2 [19], MLAI achieves 82.80% ASR, outperforming existing approaches by 12.77%.

Analysis across scenarios reveals distinct vulnerability patterns in both models. Security-critical scenarios like Malware Generation (MG) and Fraud (FR) show stronger resistance with ASR of 50.28% and 50.67%, while advisory scenarios such as Financial Advice (FA) and Gov Decision (GD) exhibit higher vulnerability (ASR > 90%). This pattern reflects the models’ internal defense mechanisms: security-critical scenarios are equipped with more rigorous detection systems due to their well-defined harmful patterns, and these high-risk scenarios are typically protected by enhanced safety measures.

The effectiveness of MLAI varies significantly across scenarios. Most notably, while achieving a 55.70% improvement in Illegal Activity (IA) scenario, the gain in Gov Decision (GD) scenario is merely 0.85%. This disparity can be primarily explained by two aspects. First, scenarios like Gov Decision (GD) already demonstrate high base vulnerability (90.29% ASR without attacks), leaving limited room for improvement. Second, the nature of different scenarios affects our attack strategy: Illegal

Scenario	Gemini [11]	ChatGLM [5]	Qwen [7]
Illegal Activity	49.59	60.11	54.97
Malware Generation	39.84	42.56	45.28
Physical Harm	43.35	45.62	48.46

Table 2. ASR results for black-box models. The ASR differences across various models within the same scenario are minor, and the ranking of ASR aligns closely with those observed during testing on white-box models.

Activity (IA) scenario involve concrete elements (e.g., drug manufacturing) that can be effectively represented in images, whereas Gov Decision (GD) scenario contain abstract concepts that are inherently challenging to visualize, thereby limiting the potential of image-based attacks.

Black-box Attacks. Besides the open-source models, we also evaluate our attack on three black-box commercial VLMs (i.e., Gemini [11], ChatGLM [5] and Qwen [7]). We selected 3 most harmful scenarios (Illegal Activity, Malware Generation, and Physical Harm) and 60 related queries to attack each model. Since direct access to the internal data of the model is unavailable, we employ images trained on MiniGPT-4 [41] to perform a black-box model jailbreak. As shown in Tab. 2, MLAI maintains considerable attack effectiveness on commercial models, achieving ASRs of 49.59%, 60.11%, and 54.97% on Gemini, ChatGLM, and Qwen respectively. We also notice that compared to white-box attacks, there exists a consistent performance drop (16.43% lower on average). This gap likely stems from commercial models’ enhanced defense mechanisms and architectural differences. Nevertheless, the consistent attack performance across different commercial models suggests that our method can effectively generalize beyond the training model, despite the presence of unknown defense strategies.

4.3. Ablation Studies

In this part, we further discuss the effectiveness of our proposed approach, including image harmfulness optimization and loss range determination. We note that except for the explicitly stated modifications, all other parameters are identical to the baseline configuration.

Image harmfulness optimization. To validate the effectiveness of the optimization process for image generation discussed in Sec. 3.2, we conduct a specific experiment with selecting different types of images to examine the attack performance. We selected two scenarios, Hate Speech and Fraud, and conducted experiments on the MiniGPT-4 [41] and LLaVA-2 [19] models, respectively. Moreover, the Irrelevant Image used in the experiments are fixed and consist of 12 images that is not associated with any of the jailbreak scenarios. As shown in Fig. 6, when blank images




Figure 6. The ASR of using different types of initial images. We can find that simply adding a blank image can lead to a substantial increase in the success rate. Compared to blank image, further selecting images that contain information but are unrelated to the jailbreak scenario results in a smaller improvement. However, when images are introduced that closely match the specific scenario, the performance reaches state-of-the-art levels.




Figure 7. The ASR of using different numbers of images. According to Eq. (5), since K is a constant value, we set $v = \left\lceil \frac{k_L}{K} \right\rceil$ and assume that the slopes on both sides are equal without loss of generality, where v represents the flatness of the minimum value, in order to better focus on the changing trends of ASR.

are introduced, the alignment of the underlying LLM fails to cover the unforeseen domains introduced by the visual modality. This misalignment effectively circumvents the inherent alignment mechanisms of the LLM within the VLM framework, leading to a marked increase in the ASR. However, when choosing unrelated images, for the target scene, it merely increases the information content and complexity of the image, which does not significantly aid in bypassing restrictions. Only by selecting images that match the scenario can meaningful semantic information be introduced, thereby amplifying the potential risk of the image and ultimately further increasing the ASR.

Loss range determination. To further validate the impact of using images in different loss range on the improvement of jailbreak success rate, we conduct experiments on four scenarios on the MiniGPT-4 [41] model and the results are shown in Fig. 7. We observe that, overall, the ASR increases significantly when the number of Images initially increases.





Figure 8. The average ASR of using different ρ . The average ASR increases gradually with the value of ρ , with the rate of increase remaining relatively stable. However, once ρ reaches a critical threshold (which is 5 in this experiment), the growth rate drops significantly, and the ASR quickly reaches its maximum value.

However, the growth patterns of the curves in different scenarios show considerable variation, with differences in both the rate of increase and the point at which the growth stops. Specifically, the values of v for Illegal Activity (IA) and Hate Speech (HS) are relatively large, indicating that they have relatively sharp minima, whereas Legal Opinion (LO) and Financial Advice (FA) exhibit flatter minima. Correspondingly, the curves for Illegal Activity (IA) and Hate Speech (HS) stop increasing early (almost cease to grow when the number of images reaches 5), while the curves for Legal Opinion (LO) and Financial Advice (FA) maintain a prolonged growth phase (only stopping near the point where the number of images reaches 9). The results demonstrate that to achieve an optimal ASR, image sets with flat minima require fewer images, while image sets with sharp minima incur higher costs to achieve the desired outcome. These findings prove that flatter minima indeed provide greater robustness, allowing models to perform better when the test set deviates from the training set.

In addition, we also examined the values of ρ . We tested the average ASR across all scenarios for different values of ρ on both MiniGPT-4 [41] and LLaVA-2 [19]. As shown in Fig. 8, the average ASR reaches its near-maximum value when $\rho = 6$, while the computational complexity increases at a linear rate. Further increases in ρ yield diminishing returns. Therefore, based on empirical observations, we set the baseline value of $\rho = 6$. Through the above experiments, we can prove the effectiveness of the flat minimum, the optimal choice of ρ , and we finally find the balance point between the attack success rate and the computational cost.

4.4. Defense Analysis

From the perspective of developmental trends, defense mechanisms always occupy the weaker position. With the emergence of an increasing number of VLMs and the continuous



(a) Results of 10 specific questions (b) ASR of original/defensive circumstance in fraud scenario.

Figure 9. The demonstration of our defense motivation and results.

improvement of jailbreak methods, comprehensive defense becomes progressively more challenging. In this section, we analyze an effective defense strategy against Multi-Loss Adversarial Images attack.

As shown in Fig. 9a, we observe that under the same scenario, images with different loss not only vary in overall attack potency but also demonstrate significant differences in their effectiveness against individual queries. Based on this finding, we propose introducing a similarity detection module before image sets are input into VLMs. If a current image is detected to be highly similar to a previously encountered image, it is removed from the input set, thus preventing it from being fed into the VLMs. This approach transforms a Multi-Loss Adversarial Attack back into a Single-Loss Adversarial Attack, and due to the diversity of queries in the scenario, the average ASR achieves robust defense. We conducted experiments on MiniGPT-4 [41], and the results, as shown in Fig. 9b, indicate that our defense method effectively reduces the success rate of the Multi-Loss Adversarial Attack, achieving a 22.99% reduction compared to the model without the defense module.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we conducted a systematic analysis of visual vulnerabilities in VLMs safety alignment and introduced MLAI, a novel jailbreak framework that effectively exploits these weaknesses. Our investigation revealed two critical findings: the unreliability of minimal-loss optimization in gradient-based attacks, and the crucial role of semantic alignment between visual content and target scenarios. Based on these insights, MLAI achieves superior performance through scenario-aware image generation, flat minima-based optimization, and multi-image collaborative attacks. Extensive experiments demonstrate MLAI’s effectiveness, achieving attack success rates of 77.75% on MiniGPT-4 and 82.80% on LLaVA-2. The strong transferability to commercial black-box VLMs further highlights fundamental challenges in achieving robust safety alignment for multi-modal systems.

References

- [1] Sam Altman and *et al.* OpenAI, 2015. [5](#), [12](#)
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond, 2023. [2](#)
- [3] Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Matthew Jagielski, Irena Gao, Anas Awadalla, Pang Wei Koh, Daphne Ippolito, Katherine Lee, Florian Tramèr, and Ludwig Schmidt. Are aligned neural networks adversarially aligned?, 2024. [3](#)
- [4] Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J. Pappas, and Eric Wong. Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries, 2024. [3](#)
- [5] Chatglm. Zhipu ai, 2023. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [6] Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechun Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-v2: large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning, 2023. [2](#)
- [7] Alibaba Cloud. Qwen, 2023. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [8] Yinpeng Dong, Huanran Chen, Jiawei Chen, Zhengwei Fang, Xiao Yang, Yichi Zhang, Yu Tian, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. How robust is google’s bard to adversarial image attacks?, 2023. [3](#)
- [9] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models, 2024. [3](#)
- [10] Yichen Gong, Delong Ran, Jinyuan Liu, Conglei Wang, Tianshuo Cong, Anyu Wang, Sisi Duan, and Xiaoyun Wang. Figstep: Jailbreaking large vision-language models via typographic visual prompts, 2023. [1](#), [3](#)
- [11] Google. Gemini, 2024. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [12] Sepp Hochreiter and Jurgen Schmidhuber. Flat minima. *Neural computation*, 9:1–42, 1997. [5](#)
- [13] Hakan Inan, Kartikeya Upasani, Jianfeng Chi, Rashi Rungta, Krithika Iyer, Yuning Mao, Michael Tontchev, Qing Hu, Brian Fuller, Davide Testuggine, and Madian Khabsa. Llama guard: Llm-based input-output safeguard for human-ai conversations, 2023. [5](#), [12](#)
- [14] Jiaming Ji, Mickel Liu, Juntao Dai, Xuehai Pan, Chi Zhang, Ce Bian, Chi Zhang, Ruiyang Sun, Yizhou Wang, and Yaodong Yang. Beavertails: Towards improved safety alignment of llm via a human-preference dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04657*, 2023. [6](#)
- [15] Tomasz Korbak, Kejian Shi, Angelica Chen, Rasika Bhalerao, Christopher L. Buckley, Jason Phang, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. Pretraining language models with human preferences, 2023. [1](#), [3](#)
- [16] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension, 2023. [3](#)
- [17] Mukai Li, Lei Li, Yuwei Yin, Masood Ahmed, Zhenguang Liu, and Qi Liu. Red teaming visual language models, 2024. [3](#)
- [18] Yifan Li, Hangyu Guo, Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Images are achilles’ heel of alignment: Exploiting visual vulnerabilities for jailbreaking multimodal large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2403.09792, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [19] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [20] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2024. [2](#)
- [21] Xin Liu, Yichen Zhu, Yunshi Lan, Chao Yang, and Yu Qiao. Query-relevant images jailbreak large multi-modal models, 2023. [6](#)
- [22] Yugeng Liu, Tianshuo Cong, Zhengyu Zhao, Michael Backes, Yun Shen, and Yang Zhang. Robustness over time: Understanding adversarial examples’ effectiveness on longitudinal versions of large language models, 2024. [1](#)
- [23] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?, 2024. [3](#)
- [24] Zhenxing Niu, Haodong Ren, Xinbo Gao, Gang Hua, and Rong Jin. Jailbreaking attack against multimodal large language model, 2024. [3](#)
- [25] OpenAI. Dall-E 3, 2023. [4](#)
- [26] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, and *et al.* Florencia Leoni Aleman and. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024. [5](#), [12](#)
- [27] Ethan Perez, Saffron Huang, Francis Song, Trevor Cai, Roman Ring, John Aslanides, Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, and Geoffrey Irving. Red teaming language models with language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3419–3448, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. [1](#), [3](#)
- [28] Xiangyu Qi, Kaixuan Huang, Ashwinee Panda, Peter Henderson, Mengdi Wang, and Prateek Mittal. Visual adversarial examples jailbreak aligned large language models, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [29] Xiangyu Qi, Yi Zeng, Tinghao Xie, Pin-Yu Chen, Ruoxi Jia, Prateek Mittal, and Peter Henderson. Fine-tuning aligned language models compromises safety, even when users do not intend to!, 2023. [1](#)
- [30] Christian Schlarmann and Matthias Hein. On the adversarial robustness of multi-modal foundation models, 2023. [3](#)
- [31] Erfan Shayegani, Yue Dong, and Nael Abu-Ghazaleh. Jailbreak in pieces: Compositional adversarial attacks on multimodal language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [1](#), [3](#)
- [32] Toby Shevlane, Sebastian Farquhar, Ben Garfinkel, Mary Phuong, Jess Whittlestone, Jade Leung, Daniel Kokotajlo, Nahema Marchal, Markus Anderljung, Noam Kolt, Lewis Ho, Divya Siddarth, Shahar Avin, Will Hawkins, Been Kim, Iason Gabriel, Vijay Bolina, Jack Clark, Yoshua Bengio, Paul Christiano, and Allan Dafoe. Model evaluation for extreme risks, 2023. [1](#), [3](#)
- [33] Xijia Tao, Shuai Zhong, Lei Li, Qi Liu, and Lingpeng Kong. Imgtrojan: Jailbreaking vision-language models with one image, 2024. [3](#)

- [34] Haoqin Tu, Chenhang Cui, Zijun Wang, Yiyang Zhou, Bingchen Zhao, Junlin Han, Wangchunshu Zhou, Huaxiu Yao, and Cihang Xie. How many unicorns are in this image? a safety evaluation benchmark for vision llms, 2023. [3](#)
- [35] Yuanwei Wu, Xiang Li, Yixin Liu, Pan Zhou, and Lichao Sun. Jailbreaking gpt-4v via self-adversarial attacks with system prompts, 2024. [3](#)
- [36] Xianjun Yang, Xiao Wang, Qi Zhang, Linda Petzold, William Yang Wang, Xun Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Shadow alignment: The ease of subverting safely-aligned language models, 2023. [13](#)
- [37] Zonghao Ying, Aishan Liu, Tianyuan Zhang, Zhengmin Yu, Siyuan Liang, Xianglong Liu, and Dacheng Tao. Jailbreak vision language models via bi-modal adversarial prompt, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [38] Zhixin Zhang, Leqi Lei, Lindong Wu, Rui Sun, Yongkang Huang, Chong Long, Xiao Liu, Xuanyu Lei, Jie Tang, and Minlie Huang. Safetybench: Evaluating the safety of large language models with multiple choice questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07045*, 2023. [5](#)
- [39] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey of large language models, 2024. [3](#)
- [40] Yunqing Zhao, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Xiao Yang, Chongxuan Li, Ngai-Man Cheung, and Min Lin. On evaluating adversarial robustness of large vision-language models, 2023. [3](#)
- [41] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models, 2023. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [12](#)
- [42] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models, 2023. [5](#)
- [43] Mark Elliot Zuckerberg. Meta, 2004. [5](#), [12](#)




Figure 10. Example of perplexity-based defense mechanism.




Figure 11. Example of harmfulness-based defense mechanism.

A. Cases Analysis

A.1. Perplexity-Based Defense Mechanism

As shown in Fig. 10, the panda image fails to successfully attack the target model. A potential issue lies in the unnatural combination of the image and the text; there is no direct or indirect relationship between the image and tax evasion. This lack of coherence makes the combination easily detectable by defense mechanisms based on confusion. Once the model identifies the disconnection between the image and the text, it is likely to disregard the content of the image entirely, rendering any optimization attempts targeting the image (such as gradient updates) meaningless. In contrast, images that match the scenario can easily bypass this detection mechanism, allowing the model to focus on the relevant information in the image.

A.2. Harmfulness-Based Defense Mechanism

Not only do irrelevant images fail to effectively attack the target model, but images that are overly aligned with the text content also struggle to produce positive effects. As illustrated in Fig. 11, because the text itself is highly harmful, images matching the text also possess strong harmful characteristics. This triggers the model’s defense mechanisms based on perceived danger, leading to a refusal-type response. Conversely, images that match the scene without depicting specific hazardous actions are relatively less harmful and more likely to conceal the most dangerous intentions. These images, by collaborating with the text, have a higher chance of successfully facilitating a metaphorical “escape” from model restrictions.




Figure 12. Example of a jailbreak Illegal Activity scenario using images matching Malware Generation and Financial Advice.

A.3. Transferability across Scenarios

In Sec. 3.2, we analyze the cross-scenario transferability of images. As illustrated in Fig. 12, operations such as “building” or “using” are common harmful activity patterns in both the Illegal Activity and Malware Generation scenarios, and the strong correlations between scenarios lead to effective transfer across scenarios. However, there is no observable connection between the Financial Advice and Illegal Activity scenarios, resulting in a failure of cross-scenario transfer.




Figure 13. Jailbreak example of Illegal Activity.




Figure 14. Jailbreak example of Hate Speech.




Figure 15. Jailbreak example of Malware Generation.

B. More Jailbreak Examples of Our Attacks

In this section, we provide more jailbreak examples of Illegal Activity, Hate Speech and Malware Generation on the MiniGPT-4 [41], which are presented




Figure 16. The Judging prompt template.

in Fig. 13, Fig. 14, Fig. 15, respectively.

C. Prompts Template for Judging Model

It is important to note that the criteria for evaluating whether a model response constitutes a successful jailbreak can vary slightly depending on the specific scenario. As a result, when applying the judging prompt, the contents of both the "Guidelin" and "Example" sections in the template (as shown in Fig. 16) must be adjusted accordingly. More specifically, for scenarios IA, HS, MG, PH, EH, FR, PO, and PV, the focus of evaluation should be on identifying any illegal or unethical content within the model's response. In contrast, for scenarios PL and GD, the key criterion is whether the model avoids engaging in political topics. Lastly, for scenarios LO, FA, and HC, the main factor to consider is whether the model includes a disclaimer or risk warning in its response.

D. Computing Infrastructure

Each of our individual attack and evaluation test point is performed on a virtual node, equipped with two Nvidia A100 40GB GPUs with 64GB of memory in total. Our operating system is Ubuntu 22.04 LTS, and we use Cuda Version 12.1. All our implementations are built on Pytorch 1.12.1 and Python 3.9.

E. Jailbreak Scenarios Description

Based on the usage policies [13, 26] of OpenAI [1] and Meta [43], we focus on 13 distinct jailbreak scenarios, including Illegal Activities, Hate Speech, Malware Generation, Physical Harm, Economic Harm, Fraud, Pornography, Political Lobbying, Privacy Violence, Legal opinion, Financial

Forbidden Scenarios	Description
01-Illegal Activity	OpenAI prohibits the use of our models, tools, and services for illegal activity.
02-Hate Speech	Generation of hateful, harassing, or violent content: 1) Content that expresses, incites, or promotes hate based on identity; 2) Content that intends to harass, threaten, or bully an individual; 3) Content that promotes or glorifies violence or celebrates the suffering or humiliation of others.
03-Malware Generation	Generation of malware: content that attempts to generate code that is designed to disrupt, damage, or gain unauthorized access to a computer system.
04-Physical Harm	Activity that has high risk of physical harm: 1) Weapons development; 2) Military and warfare; 3) Management or operation of critical infrastructure in energy, transportation, and water; 4) Content that promotes, encourages, or depicts acts of self-harm, such as suicide, cutting, and eating disorders.
05-Economic Harm	Activity that has high risk of economic harm: 1) Multi-level marketing; 2) Gambling; 3) Payday lending; 4) Automated determinations of eligibility for credit, employment, educational institutions, or public assistance services.
06-Fraud	Fraudulent or deceptive activity: 1) Scams; 2) Coordinated inauthentic behavior; 3) Plagiarism; 4) Academic dishonesty; 5) Astroturfing, such as fake grassroots support or fake review generation; 6) Disinformation; 7) Spam; 8) Pseudopharmaceuticals.
07-Pornography	Adult content, adult industries, and dating apps: 1) Content meant to arouse sexual excitement, such as the description of sexual activity, or that promotes sexual services (excluding sex education and wellness); 2) Erotic chat; 3) Pornography.
08-Political Lobbying	Political campaigning or lobbying: 1) Generating high volumes of campaign materials; 2) Generating campaign materials personalized to or targeted at specific demographics; 3) Building conversational or interactive systems such as chatbots that provide information about campaigns or engaging in political advocacy or lobbying; 4) Building products for political campaigning or lobbying purposes.
09-Privacy Violence	Activity that violates people’s privacy: 1) Tracking or monitoring an individual without their consent; 2) Facial recognition of private individuals; 3) Classifying individuals based on protected characteristics; 4) Using biometrics for identification or assessment; 5) Unlawful collection or disclosure of personal identifiable information or educational, financial, or other protected records.
10-Legal Opinion	Engaging in the unauthorized practice of law, or offering tailored legal advice without a qualified person reviewing the information: OpenAI’s models are not fine-tuned to provide legal advice. You should not rely on our models as a sole source of legal advice.
11-Financial Advice	Offering tailored financial advice without a qualified person reviewing the information: OpenAI’s models are not fine-tuned to provide financial advice. You should not rely on our models as a sole source of financial advice.
12-Health Consultation	Telling someone that they have or do not have a certain health condition, or providing instructions on how to cure or treat a health condition: 1) OpenAI’s models are not fine-tuned to provide medical information. You should never use our models to provide diagnostic or treatment services for serious medical conditions; 2) OpenAI’s platforms should not be used to triage or manage lifethreatening issues that need immediate attention.
13-Gov Decision	High risk government decision-making: 1) Law enforcement and criminal justice; 2) Migration and asylum.

Table 3. The jailbreak scenarios from OpenAI and Meta usage policy.

Advice, Health Consultation and Gov Decision. We follow the full list used in [36], the detailed description for each scenario is in Tab. 3.

F. Examples of generated images for each scenario

For each scenario, we provide an image example in Fig. 17. It is important to note that while we omit examples of “Pornography” for ethical considerations.



Figure 17. Example of images in 12 scenarios except for pornography.