

# PB-UAP: HYBRID UNIVERSAL ADVERSARIAL ATTACK FOR IMAGE SEGMENTATION

Yufei Song<sup>1</sup>, Ziqi Zhou<sup>2</sup>, Minghui Li<sup>3</sup>, Xianlong Wang<sup>1</sup>,  
Hangtao Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Menghao Deng<sup>1</sup>, Wei Wan<sup>1</sup>, Shengshan Hu<sup>1</sup>, Leo Yu Zhang<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Cyber Science and Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology,

<sup>2</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology,

<sup>3</sup>School of Software Engineering, Huazhong University of Science and Technology,

<sup>4</sup>School of Information and Communication Technology, Griffith University

**Abstract**—With the rapid advancement of deep learning, the model robustness has become a significant research hotspot, *i.e.*, adversarial attacks on deep neural networks. Existing works primarily focus on image classification tasks, aiming to alter the model’s predicted labels. Due to the output complexity and deeper network architectures, research on adversarial examples for segmentation models is still limited, particularly for universal adversarial perturbations. In this paper, we propose a novel universal adversarial attack method designed for segmentation models, which includes dual feature separation and low-frequency scattering modules. The two modules guide the training of adversarial examples in the pixel and frequency space, respectively. Experiments demonstrate that our method achieves high attack success rates surpassing the state-of-the-art methods, and exhibits strong transferability across different models.

**Index Terms**—Universal Adversarial Perturbation, Semantic Segmentation

## I. INTRODUCTION

With the development of deep learning, semantic segmentation models are playing an increasingly important role in complex scenarios such as autonomous driving [1], medical image analysis [2], and remote sensing [3]. By classifying semantic information at the pixel level, segmentation models [4]–[6] achieve accurate object segmentation. However, recent works [7], [8] demonstrate that segmentation models are vulnerable to adversarial attacks, where imperceptible noise is added to images, leading to incorrect model predictions.

Existing adversarial attacks can be categorized into sample-wise [9], [10] and universal adversarial perturbations (UAPs) [11]–[14], where UAP refers to a single perturbation applied to various examples, causing the model to produce erroneous outputs across different inputs. Despite the promising attack performance of UAPs in classification tasks, the UAP methods for segmentation models [15], [16] still fall short. The earliest UAP method [15] for segmentation builds on UAP [17] by averaging gradients over each batch to mislead the segmentation model. Another study [16] enhances the generalization of attacks across different segmentation models by utilizing feature similarities of input examples in the first layer of the model, based on the UAPGD [18] method. Although these methods optimize the traditional UAP approach, they still do not achieve satisfactory attack performance. We attribute this




Fig. 1: Illustration of fooling models using a UAP.

limitation to the direct adaptation of classification-oriented UAP techniques, which overlooks task-specific knowledge critical to segmentation.

In this paper, we propose **Pixel Blind UAP (PB-UAP)**, a novel universal adversarial attack in segmentation tasks that disrupts image features in both spatial and frequency domains. Our method aims to disable the models segmentation ability across diverse images using a single UAP (see Fig. 1). Unlike classification models that focus on global features, segmentation models concentrate more on contextual relationships within images [4], [5], [19]. Therefore, our intuition is to destroy inter-class and intra-class semantic correlations in the image to mislead the model into incorrectly segmenting the input images. In the spatial domain, we deviate the output features of adversarial examples from both the output features of benign examples and the ground truth labels, aiming to undermine inter-class semantic correlations. In the frequency domain, given that pixels within the same class primarily belong to the low-frequency components of images, we separate the low-frequency features between adversarial and original examples to disrupt intra-class semantic correlations.

In conclusion, our main contributions are three-folds. **1)** We propose an effective universal adversarial attack for segmentation tasks, dubbed PB-UAP, disrupting image features in both the spatial and frequency domains. **2)** We propose a dual feature separation and low-frequency scattering strategy that overcomes the limitations of inter-class and intra-class semantic correlations. **3)** Experimental results on three models and two benchmark datasets demonstrate that PB-UAP significantly outperforms state-of-the-art methods, and exhibits strong transferability across different models.

## II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORKS

### A. Semantic Segmentation Models

Segmentation models typically incorporate architectures such as Image Pyramid [20], Encoder-Decoder [21], Context Module [22], Spatial Pyramid Pooling [23], Atrous Convolution (AC) [5], and Atrous Spatial Pyramid Pooling (ASPP) [6]. These architectures enhance the model’s ability to capture image details by introducing multi-scale feature extraction, strengthening contextual information, or expanding the receptive field, resulting in more precise segmentation outcomes. Specifically, Deeplabv1 [5] and PSPNet [4] uses AC structure to enhance global context awareness while preserving local details without sacrificing resolution. After Deeplabv2 [6], subsequent versions [24], [25] adopted the ASPP structure, which enhances the model’s understanding of complex scenes and object boundaries through multi-scale feature aggregation. Different models have distinct architectures, resulting in varying vulnerabilities to adversarial attacks.

### B. Universal Adversarial Attacks for Segmentation

Deep learning models are vulnerable to poisoning attacks [26], [27], backdoor attacks [28]–[31], and adversarial attacks [32], [33], among which standard universal adversarial attack methods [17], [18] show outstanding performance in classification tasks. However, when applied to segmentation tasks, they exhibit limitations in disrupting the model’s understanding of contextual information. The first UAP method [15] for segmentation extends UAP [17] by averaging gradients over each batch, enabling targeted attacks on street scenes. However, this approach neglects the semantic interdependencies between classes, limiting the generalization of adversarial examples. To address this, a subsequent work [34] enhances generalization by applying data augmentation techniques that inject high-frequency information into the training images. Another research [16] demonstrate that similar feature representations in the initial layers of different models improve cross-model attack transferability. Despite these advancements, the attack success rate remains hindered by intra-class semantic dependencies. Therefore, existing work does not address the limitations of classification-based UAP methods in segmentation tasks, indicating the need for a more effective strategy.

## III. METHODOLOGY

### A. Problem Formulation

In semantic segmentation, adversarial attacks can be defined as adding imperceptible perturbations to deceive the model, causing incorrect classifications for every pixel in the image. Specifically, let  $f(x)$  denote the segmentation model, where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times H \times C}$  represents the input image, and the model’s output consists of the predicted class labels for each pixel. This optimization problem can be formulated as maximizing the cross entropy loss function  $L_{CE}$  by adjusting the perturbation  $\delta$  within the constraint set  $S$ , thereby increasing the discrepancy between the predictions and the ground truth labels  $y^{\text{true}}$ :

$$\delta^* = \arg \max_{\delta \in S} \sum L_{CE}(f(x + \delta), y^{\text{true}}). \quad (1)$$

### B. Intuition Behind PB-UAP

A successful universal adversarial attack on segmentation task should apply a UAP to induce incorrect predictions for all pixels across different examples, requiring the attack to consider both the global context and local details of the images. Specifically, it faces the following two challenges:

**Challenge I: Inter-class Semantic Correlations Limit the Universality of Attacks.** Segmentation tasks involve complex semantic correlations, including class boundaries, object shapes, and structures, making the optimization of perturbations more challenging. A universal adversarial attack must generate a single perturbation that generalizes across diverse examples, addressing variations in class boundaries, shapes, and structures. This requires identifying a common vulnerability in the model. To this end, we propose a dual feature deviation strategy, applying gradient ascent on the features of the model’s final layer and the pixel-level labels. The former disrupts the model’s global semantic understanding, weakening its reliance on class boundaries, while the latter ensures the perturbation affects diverse target labels, bypassing semantic constraints related to shapes and structures.

**Challenge II: Intra-class Semantic Correlations Weaken the Attacks.** Intra-class semantic correlations refer to the spatial relationships between pixels of the same target in an image. This correlation is evident in adjacent pixels having similar visual features and semantic information. Specifically, these pixels form coherent and similar local features in the image. When adversarial perturbations affect these regions, the model smooths the impact of the perturbations by understanding the local context. This contextual integration makes it difficult for perturbations to have significant effects within these regions, thereby reducing the success rate of adversarial attacks. Considering that in the frequency domain analysis of an image, the low-frequency components contain the overall structure and most of the smooth information of the image, while the high-frequency components, such as the edges and textures of objects, represent less semantic information, and perturbations in these areas are influenced by local context smoothing. Based on this consideration, we use low-frequency scattering to disrupt pixel correlations. Specifically, we separate the low-frequency components of adversarial examples from the original examples and increase the perturbation strength in the low-frequency regions to improve the effectiveness of the attack.

### C. PB-UAP: A Complete Illustration

In this section, we introduce PB-UAP, a hybrid spatial-frequency universal adversarial attack method designed for semantic segmentation tasks. The pipeline of PB-UAP is illustrated in Fig. 2, including a spatial attack based on dual feature deviation and a frequency attack based on low-frequency scattering. Specifically, we separate the output features of adversarial examples and benign examples at the final layer of the model, while separating the outputs of adversarial examples from the ground truth labels, in order to disrupt the




Fig. 2: The framework of PB-UAP.

semantic correlation between different target classes. Additionally, we separate the low-frequency components of adversarial examples and clean examples to break the semantic correlation between adjacent pixels of the same class, further enhancing the attack success rate. The overall optimization objective can be summarized as:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{J}_{pd} + \mathcal{J}_{fd} + k * \mathcal{J}_{ls}. \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_{pd}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{fd}$  denote the pixel-level deception attack loss and the feature distortion attack loss, respectively, while  $\mathcal{J}_{ls}$  represents the low-frequency scattering loss.

**Dual Feature Deviation** In this module, we define two loss functions as optimization objectives, including the deviation loss between the output features of adversarial examples and both the output features of original examples and the ground truth labels. First, Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) calculate the difference between output features of the adversarial examples and the ground truth labels.  $\delta$  denotes the perturbation,  $M$  is a binary matrix, where zeros and ones represent the pixel locations in the segmentation mask that are misclassified and correctly classified, respectively.  $f(x+\delta)$  and  $y_{true}$  are the outputs of the adversarial example and the ground truth labels, respectively.  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{suc}}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{fail}}$  represent the loss for pixels in which the attack succeeds and fails, respectively.

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{suc}} = -(L_{CE}(f(x+\delta), y_{true})) * M, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{fail}} = -(L_{CE}(f(x+\delta), y_{true})) * \bar{M}, \quad (4)$$

Eq. (5) illustrates the process of assigning different optimization weights to correctly and incorrectly classified pixels. The hyperparameter  $\lambda$ , with a value of 0.3, represents the weight assigned to correctly classified pixels, while  $1 - \lambda$  represents the weight assigned to incorrectly classified pixels.

$$\mathcal{J}_{pd} = \lambda \cdot \mathcal{J}_{\text{suc}} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \mathcal{J}_{\text{fail}}, \quad (5)$$

Secondly, Eq. (6) calculates the difference between the outputs of adversarial examples and benign examples, where  $L_{MSE}$  is the mean-square error loss function.

$$\mathcal{J}_{fd} = -(L_{MSE}(f(x+\delta), f(x))). \quad (6)$$

**Low-frequency Scattering** In segmentation tasks, the low-frequency regions of an image contain most of the semantic information for each object, where semantic consistency between adjacent pixels exhibits a strong spatial correlation. This spatial correlation smooths the effect of perturbations, thereby reducing attack performance. To disrupt this correlation, we use the discrete wavelet transform (DWT) [35] with a low-pass filter  $\mathcal{L}$  to decompose the image into its low-frequency component  $c_{ll}$ . Next, we use the inverse discrete wavelet transform (IDWT) to reconstruct the low-frequency component into an image  $\phi(x)$ , as detailed in Eq. 7. Subsequently, we perform low-frequency scattering by calculating the mean square error between the low-frequency images of the adversarial and original examples, thereby disrupting the correlation between adjacent pixels, as shown in Eq. 8.

$$c_{ll} = \mathcal{L}x\mathcal{L}^T, \phi(x) = \mathcal{L}^T c_{ll}\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^T(\mathcal{L}x\mathcal{L}^T)\mathcal{L}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{ls} = -(L_{MSE}(\phi(x+\delta), \phi(x))). \quad (8)$$

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

### A. Experimental Setup

**Datasets and Models.** We use two public segmentation datasets to evaluate the attack performance of our method: PASCAL VOC 2012 [36] and CITYSCAPES [37]. We choose PSPNet, Deeplabv1, and Deeplabv3+ with MobileNet and ResNet50 backbones as victim models.

**Parameter Setting.** Following [17], [18], [38], we set the upper bound of UAP to  $10/255$ . For our experiments, we set the hyperparameters  $k$ ,  $\lambda$ , and the batch size to 1, 0.3, and 5, respectively.




Fig. 3: Transferability study. Each column represents attacking different models using the same adversarial examples.

**Evaluation Metrics.** We use the Mean Intersection over Union (mIoU) to evaluate the effectiveness of PB-UAP, which is a popular metric in the segmentation field. A lower mIoU indicates stronger attack effectiveness.

### B. Attack Performance

TABLE I: The mIoU (%) of PB-UAP under different settings. Values covered by gray denote the mIoU of benign examples, others denote the mIoU of adversarial examples.

Dataset	PSPNet		Deeplabv1		Deeplabv3+	
	MobileNet	ResNet50	MobileNet	ResNet50	MobileNet	ResNet50
VOC	66.65	71.58	53.5	58.9	70.62	71.37
	10.48	16.54	9.73	14.25	12.19	18.77
	56.91	60.58	56.49	60.27	61.94	64.67
CITYSCAPES	6.02	8.6	6.61	8.71	3.17	4.41

In this section, we comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of PB-UAP. We conduct attack experiments on three segmentation models and two datasets, with two backbone networks. We calculate the mIoU of both benign and adversarial examples for each experimental setup.

According to the experimental results in Tab. I, the mIoU dropped to between 3.17% and 18.77% in all experimental setups, indicating that PB-UAP can effectively influence the output of segmentation models.

### C. Transferability Study

We investigate the attack transferability of PB-UAP across different models, using MobileNet as the backbone network. As shown in Fig. 3(a) - (b), the UAPs generated using different proxy models exhibit excellent performance on other models. These results demonstrate that PB-UAP possesses strong transferability and reliability.

### D. Comparison Study

To demonstrate the superiority of our method, we compare PB-UAP with five previous popular UAP schemes, including SegPGD [7] and TranSegPGD [8], which are state-of-the-art adversarial attacks designed for segmentation models. We select PASCAL VOC [36] as the attacked dataset, with model and backbone settings as described in Section 4.2.

The results in Tab. II indicate that PB-UAP outperforms all methods significantly. We also provide visualizations of the segmentation results of the adversarial examples generated

TABLE II: The mIoU(%) result of comparison study.

Method	PSPNet		Deeplabv1		Deeplabv3+	
	MobileNet	ResNet50	MobileNet	ResNet50	MobileNet	ResNet50
Benign	66.65	71.58	53.50	58.90	70.62	71.37
UAPGD	45.37	57.26	28.81	40.68	57.38	57.95
FFF	40.36	49.98	53.49	58.90	48.74	51.47
Hashemi	34.19	44.20	25.97	35.17	49.50	49.84
SegPGD	34.82	44.87	25.30	34.58	47.48	49.89
TranSegPGD	33.30	47.77	24.35	33.96	40.73	50.02
Ours	<b>10.48</b>	<b>16.54</b>	<b>9.73</b>	<b>14.25</b>	<b>12.19</b>	<b>18.77</b>




Fig. 4: Visualizations of the comparison study.

by these methods in Fig. 4, which further demonstrate the superiority of PB-UAP.




Fig. 5: Ablation study results (%). (a) and (b) investigate the effect of different modules and attack strengths in fake mask on PB-UAP.

### E. Ablation Study

**The effect of different modules.** We investigate the effect of various modules on the attack performance of PB-UAP, with Deeplabv3+ as the model and MobileNet as the backbone network. The results in Fig. 5 (a) show that no variants can compete with the complete method, implying the indispensability of each component for PB-UAP.

**The effect of perturbation budget.** As shown in Fig. 5 (b), we evaluate PB-UAP's attack performance in different values of  $\epsilon$ , using MobileNet as the backbone network. With the increase in  $\epsilon$ , there is a corresponding enhancement in attack performance. Notably, our attack still maintains high efficacy at the 8/255 setting, with an average mIoU exceeding 16.22%.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose PB-UAP, a universal adversarial attack specifically designed for the characteristics of segmentation models. PB-UAP can effectively induce incorrect

segmentation results in the model across different input examples with a single perturbation. To disrupt both inter-class and intra-class semantic correlations in images, we design a hybrid spatial-frequency universal attack framework. This framework consists of a dual feature deviation-based spatial attack and a low-frequency scattering-based frequency attack. We conduct extensive experiments on PSPNet, Deeplabv1, and Deeplabv3+ models. Both the qualitative and quantitative results demonstrate PB-UAP’s high attack success rates and strong attack transferability.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 62202186, No. 62372196). Ziqi Zhou is the corresponding author.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Xiaoyang Xiao, Yuqian Zhao, Fan Zhang, Biao Luo, Lingli Yu, Baifan Chen, and Chunhua Yang, “Baseg: Boundary aware semantic segmentation for autonomous driving,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 157, pp. 460–470, 2023.
- [2] Alexandr A Kalinin, Vladimir I Iglovikov, Alexander Rakhlin, and Alexey A Shvets, “Medical image segmentation using deep neural networks with pre-trained encoders,” *Deep learning applications*, pp. 39–52, 2020.
- [3] Shouji Du, Shihong Du, Bo Liu, and Xiuyuan Zhang, “Incorporating deeplabv3+ and object-based image analysis for semantic segmentation of very high resolution remote sensing images,” *International Journal of Digital Earth*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 357–378, 2021.
- [4] Hengshuang Zhao, Jianping Shi, Xiaojuan Qi, Xiaogang Wang, and Jiaya Jia, “Pyramid scene parsing network,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR’17)*, 2017, pp. 2881–2890.
- [5] Liang-Chieh Chen, George Papandreou, Iasonas Kokkinos, Kevin Murphy, and Alan L Yuille, “Semantic image segmentation with deep convolutional nets and fully connected crfs,” *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR’15)*, 2015.
- [6] Liang-Chieh Chen, George Papandreou, Iasonas Kokkinos, Kevin Murphy, and Alan L Yuille, “Deeplab: Semantic image segmentation with deep convolutional nets, atrous convolution, and fully connected crfs,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 834–848, 2017.
- [7] Jindong Gu, Hengshuang Zhao, Volker Tresp, and Philip HS Torr, “Segpgd: An effective and efficient adversarial attack for evaluating and boosting segmentation robustness,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV’22)*. Springer, 2022, pp. 308–325.
- [8] Xiaojun Jia, Jindong Gu, Yihao Huang, Simeng Qin, Qing Guo, Yang Liu, and Xiaochun Cao, “Transepgd: Improving transferability of adversarial examples on semantic segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02207*, 2023.
- [9] Minghui Li, Jiangxiong Wang, Hao Zhang, Ziqi Zhou, Shengshan Hu, and Xiaobing Pei, “Transferable adversarial facial images for privacy protection,” in *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM’24)*, 2024.
- [10] Ziqi Zhou, Bowen Li, Yufei Song, Shengshan Hu, Wei Wan, Leo Yu Zhang, Dezhong Yao, and Hai Jin, “Numbod: A spatial-frequency fusion attack against object detectors,” in *Proceedings of the 39th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI’25)*, 2025.
- [11] Gabriel Resende Machado, Eugénio Silva, and Ronaldo Ribeiro Goldschmidt, “Adversarial machine learning in image classification: A survey toward the defender’s perspective,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1–38, 2021.
- [12] Ziqi Zhou, Shengshan Hu, Ruizhi Zhao, Qian Wang, Leo Yu Zhang, Junhui Hou, and Hai Jin, “Downstream-agnostic adversarial examples,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV’23)*, 2023, pp. 4345–4355.
- [13] Ziqi Zhou, Shengshan Hu, Minghui Li, Hangtao Zhang, Yechao Zhang, and Hai Jin, “Advclip: Downstream-agnostic adversarial examples in multimodal contrastive learning,” in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM’23)*, 2023, pp. 6311–6320.
- [14] Ziqi Zhou, Yufei Song, Minghui Li, Shengshan Hu, Xianlong Wang, Leo Yu Zhang, Dezhong Yao, and Hai Jin, “Darksam: Fooling segment anything model to segment nothing,” in *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS’24)*, 2024.
- [15] Jan Hendrik Metzen, Mummadi Chaithanya Kumar, Thomas Brox, and Volker Fischer, “Universal adversarial perturbations against semantic image segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV’17)*, 2017, pp. 2755–2764.
- [16] Atiye Sadat Hashemi, Andreas Bär, Saeed Mozaffari, and Tim Fingscheidt, “Improving transferability of generated universal adversarial perturbations for image classification and segmentation,” in *Deep Neural Networks and Data for Automated Driving: Robustness, Uncertainty Quantification, and Insights Towards Safety*, pp. 171–196. Springer International Publishing Cham, 2022.
- [17] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, Omar Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard, “Universal adversarial perturbations,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR’17)*, 2017, pp. 1765–1773.
- [18] Yingpeng Deng and Lina J Karam, “Universal adversarial attack via enhanced projected gradient descent,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP’20)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1241–1245.
- [19] Kuiliang Gao, Anzhu Yu, Xiong You, Chunping Qiu, and Bing Liu, “Prototype and context-enhanced learning for unsupervised domain adaptation semantic segmentation of remote sensing images,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 61, pp. 1–16, 2023.
- [20] Yun Wu, Jianyong Jiang, Zimeng Huang, and Youliang Tian, “Fpanet: Feature pyramid aggregation network for real-time semantic segmentation,” *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 3319–3336, 2022.
- [21] Yongfeng Xing, Luo Zhong, and Xian Zhong, “An encoder-decoder network based fcn architecture for semantic segmentation,” *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, vol. 2020, no. 1, pp. 8861886, 2020.
- [22] Tianyi Wu, Sheng Tang, Rui Zhang, Juan Cao, and Yongdong Zhang, “Cgnet: A light-weight context guided network for semantic segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 1169–1179, 2020.
- [23] Fung Xin Ru, Mohd Asyraf Zulkifley, Siti Raihanah Abdani, and Martin Spraggon, “Forest segmentation with spatial pyramid pooling modules: a surveillance system based on satellite images,” *Forests*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 405, 2023.
- [24] Liang-Chieh Chen, George Papandreou, Florian Schroff, and Hartwig Adam, “Rethinking atrous convolution for semantic image segmentation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05587*, 2017.
- [25] Liang-Chieh Chen, Yukun Zhu, George Papandreou, Florian Schroff, and Hartwig Adam, “Encoder-decoder with atrous separable convolution for semantic image segmentation,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV’18)*, 2018, pp. 801–818.
- [26] Hangtao Zhang, Zeming Yao, Leo Yu Zhang, Shengshan Hu, Chao Chen, Alan Liew, and Zhetao Li, “Denial-of-service or fine-grained control: Towards flexible model poisoning attacks on federated learning,” in *Proceedings of the 31st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’23*, 2023.
- [27] Xianlong Wang, Minghui Li, Wei Liu, Hangtao Zhang, Shengshan Hu, Yechao Zhang, Ziqi Zhou, and Hai Jin, “Unlearnable 3d point clouds: Class-wise transformation is all you need,” in *The 38th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS’24)*, 2024.
- [28] Shengshan Hu, Ziqi Zhou, Yechao Zhang, Leo Yu Zhang, Yifeng Zheng, Yuanyuan He, and Hai Jin, “Badhash: Invisible backdoor attacks against deep hashing with clean label,” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia (ACM MM’22)*, 2022, pp. 678–686.
- [29] Hangtao Zhang, Shengshan Hu, Yichen Wang, Leo Yu Zhang, Ziqi Zhou, Xianlong Wang, Yanjun Zhang, and Chao Chen, “Detector collapse: Backdooring object detection to catastrophic overload or blindness,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’24*, 2024.

- [30] Xianlong Wang, Hewen Pan, Hangtao Zhang, Minghui Li, Shengshan Hu, Ziqi Zhou, Lulu Xue, Peijin Guo, Yichen Wang, Wei Wan, et al., “Trojanrobot: Backdoor attacks against robotic manipulation in the physical world,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11683*, 2024.
- [31] Zeming Yao, Hangtao Zhang, Yicheng Guo, Xin Tian, Wei Peng, Yi Zou, Leo Yu Zhang, and Chao Chen, “Reverse backdoor distillation: Towards online backdoor attack detection for deep neural network models,” *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2024.
- [32] Hangtao Zhang, Chenyu Zhu, Xianlong Wang, Ziqi Zhou, Changgan Yin, Minghui Li, Lulu Xue, Yichen Wang, Shengshan Hu, Aishan Liu, et al., “Badrobot: Manipulating embodied llms in the physical world,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.20242*, 2024.
- [33] Yichen Wang, Yuxuan Chou, Ziqi Zhou, Hangtao Zhang, Wei Wan, Shengshan Hu, and Minghui Li, “Breaking barriers in physical-world adversarial examples: Improving robustness and transferability via robust feature,” in *Proceedings of the 39th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI’25)*, 2025.
- [34] Chaoning Zhang, Philipp Benz, Adil Karjauv, and In So Kweon, “Data-free universal adversarial perturbation and black-box attack,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV’21)*, 2021, pp. 7868–7877.
- [35] Cheng Luo, Qinliang Lin, Weicheng Xie, Bizhu Wu, Jinheng Xie, and Linlin Shen, “Frequency-driven imperceptible adversarial attack on semantic similarity,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR’22)*, 2022, pp. 15315–15324.
- [36] Mark Everingham, Luc Van Gool, Christopher KI Williams, John Winn, and Andrew Zisserman, “The pascal visual object classes (voc) challenge,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 88, pp. 303–338, 2010.
- [37] Marius Cordts, Mohamed Omran, Sebastian Ramos, Timo Rehfeld, Markus Enzweiler, Rodrigo Benenson, Uwe Franke, Stefan Roth, and Bernt Schiele, “The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR’16)*, 2016, pp. 3213–3223.
- [38] Ziqi Zhou, Minghui Li, Wei Liu, Shengshan Hu, Yechao Zhang, Wei Wan, Lulu Xue, Leo Yu Zhang, Dezhong Yao, and Hai Jin, “Securely fine-tuning pre-trained encoders against adversarial examples,” in *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP’24)*, 2024.