

# Ad-versarial: Perceptual Ad-Blocking meets Adversarial Machine Learning

Florian Tramèr  
Stanford University

Pascal Dupré  
CISPA

Gili Rusak  
Stanford University

Giancarlo Pellegrino  
Stanford University & CISPA

Dan Boneh  
Stanford University

## Abstract

*Perceptual ad-blocking* is a novel approach that detects online advertisements using visual cues. Compared to traditional filter lists, perceptual ad-blocking is believed to be less prone to an arms race with web publishers and ad networks. In this work, we use techniques from adversarial machine learning to demonstrate that this may not be the case. We show that perceptual ad-blocking engenders a new arms race that likely disfavors ad-blockers. Unexpectedly, perceptual ad-blocking can also introduce new vulnerabilities that let an attacker bypass web security boundaries and mount DDoS attacks.

We first analyze the design space of perceptual ad-blockers and present a unified architecture that incorporates prior academic and commercial work. We then explore a variety of attacks on the ad-blocker’s visual detection pipeline, that enable publishers or ad networks to evade or detect ad-blocking, and at times even abuse its high privilege level to bypass web security boundaries. Our attacks exploit the unreasonably strong threat model that perceptual ad-blockers must resist.

Finally, we present a concrete set of attacks on an ad-blocker’s internal ad-classifier by constructing *adversarial examples* in a real Web page context. For six ad-detection techniques, we create perturbed ads, perturbed ad-disclosure logos, and native web content that misleads perceptual ad-blocking with 100% success rates. In one of our attacks, we demonstrate how a malicious user can upload adversarial content, such as a perturbed image in a Facebook post, that fools the ad-blocker into removing another users’ non-ad content.

Moving beyond the Web and visual domain, we also build adversarial examples for AdblockRadio, an open source radio client that uses machine learning to detects ads in raw audio.

## 1 Introduction

Online advertising is a contentious facet of the Web. On one hand, online ads generate over \$200 billion in value [80]; on the other, many Internet users perceive them as intrusive or malicious [41,46,63,83]. The growing use of ad-blockers such

as Adblock Plus and uBlock [1,8] has sparked a fierce arms race with publishers and advertising networks. Ad-blockers maintain large crowdsourced ad filter lists, while publishers and ad networks continuously adapt to evade them.

*Perceptual ad-blocking* is a novel approach to ad-detection that relies on *visual cues* to detect ads. Storey et al. [74] proposed this idea under the premise that many ad networks are required to add an explicit visual ad disclosure, such as a “Sponsored” caption or the ubiquitous AdChoices logo [22] (Figure 2), to the ads they serve. Perceptual ad-blocking has been posited as less prone to an arms race compared to filter lists [74]. Indeed, evading perceptual ad-blocking requires altering ads’ visual content, thereby presumably affecting users’ browsing experience or violating ad-disclosure requirements set by law [24] or industry self-regulation [22].

Ad-Highlighter [74,75]—the first deployed perceptual ad-blocker—gained sufficient popularity to cause Facebook to respond [74]. Yet, as of today, Ad-Highlighter still blocks most Facebook ads as well as ads that use the AdChoices standard [22]. The alleged superior robustness of perceptual ad-blocking has recently prompted Adblock Plus, a popular ad-block developer, to develop Sentinel [9], a neural network-based perceptual ad-blocker that detects ads in rendered web pages. The use of sensory data to detect and block ads goes beyond the Web and the visual domain: AdblockRadio is a radio player that uses machine learning to detect and remove ads in raw audio streams of over 60 stations [2].

While the filter list arms-race has been extensively studied [38,56], little is known about the resilience of perceptual ad-blockers under attack. They are *believed* to be less prone to an arms race [74], but their strengths and limitations have not yet been fully analyzed.

**Security Analysis.** In this paper, we present a comprehensive security analysis of perceptual ad-blocking. The nascent state of this technology brings forth a rare opportunity in computer security—to inform the on-going design of new systems and anticipate pitfalls. First, we review existing perceptual ad-blockers, i.e., Ad-Highlighter [74,75] and Adblock Plus’ Sentinel [9,57], as well as ad-detection approaches proposed

by the computer vision community (e.g., [36]). Then, we present a general architecture for perceptual ad-blockers that incorporates and extends existing techniques. Our architecture covers offline creation and online usage of perceptual ad-blockers, while allowing for varied approaches to the core ad-detection step. Given this unified view of the design space, we move to the central question considered in this work:

*How robust is perceptual ad-blocking?*

We tackle this question through the lens of machine learning (ML) security [60]. We view a perceptual ad-blocker as a visual classifier, that a number of adversaries—publishers, ad networks, advertisers or content creators—aim to subvert. We then identify multiple points in the ad-classification pipeline that can be exploited to evade, detect and abuse ad-blockers. Hostile strategies range from classical attacks on web agents (e.g., DOM obfuscation) to threats unique to machine learning, such as data poisoning and *adversarial examples* [76].

We next evaluate the impact of adversarial examples on an ad-blockers’ core visual classifier. To our knowledge, this constitutes the first application of adversarial examples to a real-world web-security problem. We rigorously assess the robustness of *six* visual ad-classifiers:

- Two models (perceptual hashing and OCR) used in the deployed Ad-Highlighter system [74];
- An ad-classification neural network from [36];
- A canonical SIFT feature matching model [47]; and
- Two object detector networks emulating Sentinel [9].

We implemented some of these ourselves (the SIFT model and the two object detectors), to cover possible designs that were absent in prior work (or not yet deployed [9]). The most ambitious classifier we built locates ads in screenshots from hundreds of news websites. Interestingly, it generalizes well to locate ads in pages never seen during training, while running at a rate of 1.5 fps on a desktop CPU. These novel perceptual ad-blocking approaches may be of independent interest, although we do show that they are all vulnerable to attack. To ensure fair evaluation of all classifiers, different authors independently designed and attacked these ad-blockers.

**Attacks.** To attack visual ad-classifiers, we craft imperceptible adversarial examples for ads, ad-disclosures such as the AdChoices logo, and native content. These let publishers, ad networks and advertisers evade ad-detection altogether, or detect ad-blockers by triggering them on honeypots [54]).

Ad-blockers such as Sentinel [9] present the most interesting challenges. Their classifier’s input is a rendered image of a structured web page with contents controlled by different entities (e.g, publishers and ad networks). Adversarial examples must be encoded into HTML elements that the adversary controls, be robust to content changes from other parties, and scale to thousands of pages and ads. We solve these challenges via a novel combination of adversarial examples techniques such as *transformation-robust attacks* for




Figure 1: **Ad-Blocker Privilege Hijacking.** Jerry posts adversarial content to Facebook that fools a perceptual ad-blocker similar to Sentinel [9] into marking Tom’s benign content as an ad (red box) and blocking it in the user’s browser.

physical systems [11, 69] and *universal* perturbations [52]. We successfully create adversarial examples that work for all websites and ads combinations with near 100% probability.

Next we show that adversarial examples enable new attacks, wherein malicious content from one user causes the ad-blocker to incorrectly block another user’s content. An example is shown in Figure 1. Here Jerry, the adversary, uploads a perturbed image to Facebook. That image is placed next to Tom’s post, and confuses the ad-blocker into classifying Tom’s benign post as an ad, and incorrectly blocking it.

Moving beyond the Web and visual domain, we also build imperceptible audio adversarial examples that fool the ML and fingerprinting ad-detectors used by AdblockRadio [2].

**Outlook.** Our attacks are not just another step in an arms race, where ad-blockers can easily regain the upper hand. Instead, they describe an inherent difficulty with the perceptual ad-blocking approach. Web ad-blockers operate in essentially the *worst threat model for visual classifiers*. Their adversaries prepare (offline) digital attacks to evade or falsely trigger a known *white-box* visual classifier running inside the ad-blocker. In contrast, the ad-blocker must resist these attacks while operating under strict real-time constraints.

The goal of our study is not to downplay the merits of ad-blocking, nor discredit the perceptual ad-blocking philosophy. Indeed, ML might one day achieve human-level perception. Instead, we highlight and raise awareness of the inherent vulnerabilities that arise from instantiating perceptual ad-blockers with existing ML techniques. Our results suggest that perceptual ad-blockers will engender a new arms race that overwhelmingly favors publishers and ad networks.

**Contributions.** This paper makes the following contributions:

- We conduct the first comprehensive security analysis of perceptual ad-blocking;
- We identify eight general classes of attacks against the various components of the perceptual ad-blocking pipeline;
- We rigorously evaluate the impact of adversarial examples on seven ad classifiers (six visual, one audio). Our attacks exploit the full adversarial examples toolbox—white-box,

black-box, transformation-robust and universal attacks—for feed-forward, sequential and object-detection models;

- We plan to release all our data and classifiers, including a new neural network that locates ads in web page screenshots, that may prove useful *in non-adversarial settings*.

## 2 Preliminaries and Background

### 2.1 The Online Advertising Ecosystem

Online advertising comprises four types of actors: visitors, publishers, ad networks, and advertisers. Visitors are users browsing websites. The publisher is the owner or content curator of a website, and assigns parts of the site’s layout to advertisements. Control of these spaces is often outsourced to an ad network that populates them with advertisers’ contents.

Web advertisement is governed by legal requirements, e.g. FTC regulations against deceptive advertising in the U.S. [24]. These provisions have also spawned industry self-regulations, such as the *AdChoices* disclosure standard [22] (see Figure 2).

### 2.2 Perceptual Ad-Blocking

Perceptual ad-blocking is a new approach that identifies ads using *visual* cues, instead of crowdsourced filter lists of URLs and markup. The original insight of Storey et al. [74] was that many online ads are explicitly marked—e.g., via a “Sponsored” link or the AdChoices logo—to comply with the law and industry standards. They built Ad-Highlighter [75], a perceptual ad-blocker that uses computer vision algorithms (OCR and fuzzy image search) to detect ad identifiers. Their thesis is that perceptual ad-blocking will be less prone to an arms-race, as modifying the visual cues they rely on would affect user experience or violate ad-disclosure regulations.

Perceptual ad-blocking has drawn the attention of ad-block developers such as those of Adblock Plus. In its most recent version (v3.4.2, Dec. 2018), Adblock Plus supports filters that match web images against a fixed template [6]. While only exact image matches are currently supported, fuzzy matching techniques as in Ad-Highlighter are a natural extension. A more ambitious goal is tackled by Adblock Plus’ recently introduced Sentinel project [9], that aims to detect ads directly in rendered web pages. Sentinel uses an object-detection neural network to locate ads in raw screenshots of Facebook [9].

Perceptual ad-blockers are client-side programs running within users’ browsers at a high privilege level. They can be implemented as browser extensions or directly integrated into the browser (e.g., as for filter lists in Brave [55]).

**Goals.** Perceptual ad-blockers must detect and hide ads on visited web pages, while guarding against *site-breakage* [4] resulting from the removal of functional web content. By relying on purportedly robust visual cues, perceptual ad-blockers operate solely on downloaded resources and relinquish the ability to block ad network traffic. Thus, perceptual ad-blocking abandons some secondary goals of ad-blockers (bandwidth




Figure 2: **The AdChoices Logo.** AdChoices is a standard for disclosure of behavioral advertising [22]. Ads are marked by the icon (a), with optional text (b). Despite creative guidelines [23], many variants of the logo are in use (c).

savings, blocking tracking and malvertising [41, 46, 63, 83]), in favor of increased robustness for its core ad-hiding task. Perceptual ad-blockers can also complement filter-lists (e.g., as in Adblock Plus [6]) to aim at the best of both worlds.

Ad-blockers may strive to remove ads without being detected by the publisher’s web server or client-side JavaScript. As perceptual ad-blockers do not interfere with web requests, they are undetectable by the remote server [74].

Perceptual ad-blockers have strict timing constraints, and should visually process a web page and detect ads in close to real-time, e.g., as a user scrolls through a page.

### 2.3 Threat Model and Adversaries

Perceptual ad-blocking bridges the threat models of ad-blockers and visual classifiers. We use the ML security terminology, where the owner of a classifier (the ad-blocker) is the defender and entities that attack the classifier are adversaries.

Publishers, ad networks, and advertisers have financial incentives to develop attacks that evade or detect ad-blockers. We assume that publishers and ad networks only attack ad-blockers in ways that do not disrupt regular users’ browsing experience. Advertisers, in contrast, have been shown to attack website users, e.g., by distributing malware [83].

As ad-blockers are client-side software, their adversaries have full offline access to their code. However, attackers do not know *a priori* whether a user is running an ad-blocker.

**Attacking ad-blockers.** First, adversaries may attempt to *evade* ad-blockers, by modifying web content or ads to fool the ad-detector. They may also try to abuse ad-blockers’ behaviors (e.g., slow performance) to hamper their usability.

Second, adversaries may try to detect if a user is blocking ads, and display warnings or deny access. Some publishers add fake ads (honeypots) to websites and verify that they are blocked using client-side JavaScript [85]. This practice leads to an orthogonal arms-race on ad-block detection [53, 54, 56].

Finally, some adversaries may try to attack users or other web actors. These attackers exploit vulnerabilities in ad-blockers or abuse their high privilege level.

### 2.4 Machine Learning and Adversarial Examples

We will consider different visual ML classifiers in this paper:

- *Template matching models*, e.g., SIFT [47], map an image  $x$  to a feature vector  $y = f(x)$ , and compare this feature vector to that of a template image to assess perceptual similarity.

- *Feed-forward models* are standard neural networks that on input  $x$  output a confidence score for each class.
- *Sequential models* are neural networks that operate over a sequence of inputs  $X = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(t)})$  and output a sequence of class probability vectors  $f(X) = Y \in [0, 1]^{I \times C}$ .
- *Object detector models* are neural networks that predict a matrix  $f(x) = Y$  of objects located in an image  $x$ . Each row of  $Y$  defines coordinates of a bounding box, a confidence score, and a predicted object for that box. The YOLO v3 [67] model outputs  $B = 10,647$  object boxes, and discards those with confidence below a threshold  $\tau = 0.5$ .

**Adversarial Examples.** An adversarial example [76] for an input  $x$  of a model  $f$  is an input  $\hat{x} = x + \delta$ , where  $\delta$  is a “small” perturbation such that  $\hat{x}$  is misclassified with high confidence. We will consider perturbations with small  $\ell_2$  norm (Euclidean) or  $\ell_\infty$  norm (maximum per-pixel change).

To generate adversarial examples, we minimize a differentiable *loss function*  $\mathcal{L}(x + \delta)$  that acts as a proxy for the adversarial goal. To cause a feed-forward model  $f$  to misclassify  $x + \delta$  we would minimize the confidence of  $f(x + \delta)$  in the true class, while also keeping  $\delta$  small.

An effective algorithm for finding adversarial examples is *Projected Gradient Descent* (PGD) [43, 48]. Given an allowable perturbation set (e.g.,  $\|\delta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ ), we repeatedly update  $\delta$  in the gradient direction  $-\nabla_\delta \mathcal{L}(x + \delta)$  and then project onto the allowable set (e.g., by clipping all entries of  $\delta$  to  $[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$ ).

A *universal* adversarial example is a single perturbation  $\delta$  that works on many inputs  $x_i$  [52]. They are created by jointly minimizing  $\mathcal{L}(x + \delta)$  over many inputs  $x$ , for a common  $\delta$ .

## 2.5 Non-Visual Perceptual Ad-Blocking

As defined by Storey et al. [74], perceptual ad-blockers also rely on *behavioral* cues, e.g., the presence of a link to an ad policy page. In particular, Ad-Highlighter detects “Sponsored” links on Facebook by clicking on links to check if they lead to an ad policy page [75]. This approach is risky, as an adversary might be able to forge behavioral cues and trigger the ad-blocker into clicking on malicious content, thus enabling attacks such as CSRF [61], DDoS [62] or click-fraud [20].

Perceptual techniques for ad-blocking have also been considered off the Web. For example, AdblockRadio detects ads in raw radio streams using neural networks [2].

The main focus of our paper is on visual perceptual ad-blockers on the Web, so a detailed discussion of the above techniques is out of scope. For completeness, we show an attack on AdblockRadio’s audio classifier in Section 6, and give further details on behavioral ad-blocking in Appendix A.

## 3 Perceptual Ad-Blockers

To analyze the security of perceptual ad-blockers, we first propose a unified architecture that incorporates and extends prior work [6, 9, 36, 74]. We identify different ways in which

perceptual ad-blockers can be designed, and the computer vision and ML techniques that can be used to identify ads.

### 3.1 General Architecture

A perceptual ad-blocker is defined by a collection of offline and online steps, with the goal of creating, maintaining and using a classifier to detect ads. Figure 3 summarizes our unified architecture for perceptual ad-blockers. The ad-blocker’s core classifier can range from simple computer vision tools as in Ad-Highlighter [75], to large ML models (e.g., Sentinel [9]).

The classifier is created from labeled web data, the type and amount of which will vary for different classifiers. Due to continuous changes in web content (and an ad-blocking war), classifiers may need regular updates, which can range from extending existing rules (e.g., for Ad-Highlighter [74, 75]), to re-training complex ML models such as Sentinel [9].

When deployed by a user, the ad-blocker analyzes data from visited pages to detect and block ads in real-time. Ad detection consists of three main steps. (1) The ad-blocker optionally segments the web page into smaller chunks. (2) A classifier labels each chunk as ad or non-ad content. (3) The ad-blocker acts on the underlying web page based on these predictions (e.g., to remove HTML elements labeled as ads).

### 3.2 Approaches to Ad Detection

When online, a perceptual ad-blocker’s first action is the “Page Segmentation” step that prepares inputs for the classifier. The web page displayed in Figure 4 serves to illustrate different possible segmentations. A cross-origin `iframe` (red box 3) displays an ad and an AdChoices icon (purple box 2). An additional custom ad-disclosure is added by the publisher outside the `iframe` (purple box 1). Publishers may use `iframes` to display native content such as videos (e.g., red box 4).

We distinguish three main perceptual ad-blocking designs that vary in the granularity of their segmentation step, and in turn in the choice of classifier and actions taken to block ads.

- *Element-based perceptual ad-blockers*, such as Ad-Highlighter [75] and Adblock Plus’ image filters [6], search a page’s DOM tree for HTML elements that identify ads, e.g., the AdChoices logo or other ad-disclosures.
- *Page-based perceptual ad-blockers*, e.g., Sentinel [9], ignore the DOM and classify images of rendered web pages.
- *Frame-based perceptual ad-blockers*. These also classify rendered web content but use the DOM for segmenting pages into regions likely to contain ads.

We discuss each in turn.

**Element-Based Perceptual Ad-Blocking.** Element-based ad-blockers segment pages into HTML elements that are likely to contain ad-disclosures. The segmentation can be coarse (e.g., Ad-Highlighter extracts all `img` tags from a page) or use custom filters as in Adblock Plus’ image search [6].

For standardized ad-disclosures (e.g., the AdChoices logo), filtered elements can be classified by comparing to a template




Figure 3: **Architecture of a Perceptual Ad-Blocker.** Perceptual ad-blocking is a visual classification pipeline. In the offline phase, an ad-classifier is trained on labeled web data. In the online phase, visited websites are segmented and fed into the classifier. The ad-blocker uses these predictions to render the user’s ad-free viewport.




Figure 4: **Perceptual Ad-Blocking Elements.** An ad (box #1) is displayed in an `iframe`, that contains an AdChoices icon (box #2). A custom ad-disclosure from the publisher outside the `iframe` (box #3). Publishers can use `iframes` to display non-ad content such as videos (box #4).

(i.e., *template matching*). Yet, due to many small variations in ad-disclosures in use, *exact* matching (as in Adblock Plus [6]) is likely insufficient [74]. Instead, Ad-Highlighter uses more robust *perceptual hashes* to match `img` elements against the AdChoices logo. Ad-identifiers can also be classified using supervised ML. For example, Ad-Highlighter uses Optical Character Recognition (OCR) to detect the “AdChoices” text in the logo [75]. Once an ad-identifier is found, the associated ad is found using custom rules (e.g., when Ad-Highlighter finds an AdChoices logo, it blocks the parent `iframe`).

**Frame-Based Perceptual Ad-Blocking.** Element-based ad-blocking requires mapping elements in the DOM to rendered content (to ensure that elements are visible, and to map detected ad-identifiers to ads). As shown in Section 4.2, this step is non-trivial and exploitable if ad-blockers do not closely emulate the browser’s DOM rendering, a complex process that varies across browsers. Alternatively, ad-blockers can directly operate on rendered images of a page, which many browsers (e.g., Chrome and Firefox) make available to extensions.

To avoid operating on an entire rendered web page (see page-based ad-blockers below), DOM features can be used to segment a page into regions likely to contain ads. For example, segmenting a page into screenshots of each `iframe` is a good starting point for detecting ads from external ad networks.

We consider two ways to classify segments. The first searches for ad-disclosures in rendered `iframes`. Template-

matching is insufficient here, due to the high variability of backgrounds that ad-disclosures are overlaid on. Instead, we view this as an object-detection problem that can be addressed with supervised ML. The second approach is to train a visual classifier to directly detect ad content. Hussain et al. [36] report promising results for this challenging task.

**Page-Based Perceptual Ad-Blocking.** The core idea of perceptual ad-blocking is that ad-blockers can mimic the way humans visually detect ads. Element-based and frame-based techniques embrace this insight to some extent, but still rely on DOM information that humans are oblivious to. Recently, Adblock Plus proposed an approach that fully emulates visual detection of online ads from rendered web content alone [9].

In a page-based ad-blocker, segmentation is integrated into the classifier. Its core task is best viewed as an object-detection problem: given a web page screenshot, identify the location and dimension of ads. Adblock Plus trained a YOLO object-detector model [65–67] on screenshots of Facebook, wherein ads had been labeled using ad filter-lists. These classifiers require large amounts of data to generalize to unseen web pages or content. To this end, Adblock Plus further crowdsourced the collection of Facebook screenshots to train Sentinel.

Once ad locations are predicted, the ad-blocker can overlay them to hide ads, or remove the underlying HTML elements (e.g., by using the `document.elementFromPoint` browser API to get the HTML element rendered at some coordinate).

## 4 A Taxonomy of Attacks On Perceptual Ad-Blockers

We describe a panoply of attacks targeting each step in the ad classification pipeline: offline data collection and training (Section 4.1); page segmentation (Section 4.2); the core visual classifier (Section 4.3); and the ad-blocker’s high-privilege actions (Section 4.4). These classes of attacks have varying impact depending on the chosen ad-blocker instantiation. They are summarized in Table 1 and, when put together, threaten the viability of deploying perceptual ad-blockers.

### 4.1 Attacks against Training

All ad-classifiers we consider are built (or trained) from labeled images. The data collection and training phase of these

Table 1: **Attack Strategies on Perceptual Ad-Blockers.** Strategies are grouped by the component that they exploit—(D)ata collection, (S)egmentation, (C)lassification, (A)ction. For each strategy, we specify which goals it can achieve, which adversaries can execute it, and which ad-blockers it applies to (fully: ● or partially: ○).

| Strategy                                    | Goals   |           | Actors |           |            | Target     |                 |
|---|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------------|
|   | Evasion | Detection | Abuse  | Publisher | Ad Network | Advertiser | Content creator |
| D1: Data Training Poisoning                 | ●       | ●         | ●      | ●         | ●          | ●          | ●               |
| S1: DOM Obfuscation                         | ●       | ●         | ○      | ●         | ●          | ○          | ○               |
| S2: Resource Exhaustion (over-Segmentation) | ●       | ○         | ○      | ●         | ●          | ●          | ○               |
| C1: Detection with Adversarial Honeypots    | ○       | ●         | ○      | ○         | ○          | ○          | ●               |
| C2: Evasion with Adversarial Ad-Disclosure  | ●       | ○         | ○      | ○         | ○          | ○          | ●               |
| C3: Evasion with Adversarial Ads            | ●       | ○         | ○      | ○         | ●          | ○          | ●               |
| C4: Evasion with Adversarial Content        | ●       | ○         | ○      | ○         | ○          | ○          | ●               |
| A1: Cross-Boundary Blocking                 | ○       | ○         | ●      | ○         | ○          | ○          | ●               |

ad-blockers can be vulnerable to *data poisoning attacks* (D1)—especially when crowdsourced (e.g., as with Sentinel [9]).

An adversary can add malicious data into the training set to degrade the accuracy of the ad-blocker’s classifier [14]. For example, training data submitted by malicious clients can contain *visual backdoors* [19], which are later used to evade the ad-blocker. The ad-blocker developer cannot tell if a client is contributing real data for training or malicious samples.

Similar attacks against crowdsourced filter lists such as Easylist are theoretically possible. A malicious user could propose changes to filter lists that degrade their utility. However, new filters are easily interpreted and vetted before inclusion—a property not shared by visual classifiers.

Sentinel’s crowdsourced data collection of users’ Facebook feeds also raises serious privacy concerns, as a deployed model might leak parts of its training data [28, 70].

## 4.2 Attacks against Page Segmentation

Next, we discuss attacks that target the ad-blocker’s page segmentation logic, in an effort to evade ad detection (S1) or exhaust the ad-blocker’s resources (S2).

**DOM Obfuscation Attacks.** (S1) These attacks aim to fool the ad-blocker into feeding ambiguous inputs to its classifier. Element-based ad-blockers such as Ad-Highlighter [75] or Adblock Plus’ image matching [6] assume an implicit correspondence between elements in the DOM and their visual representation when rendered. For example, Ad-Highlighter assumes that all `img` tags in the DOM are shown as is, thereby ignoring potentially complex CSS transformations applied when rendering HTML. This can cause the downstream classifier to process images with unexpected properties.

Ad networks already use CSS rules that significantly alter rendered ad-disclosures. Figure 5 shows two AdChoices logos




Figure 5: **Image Sprites of the AdChoices Logo.** Image-sprites are sets of images stored in a single file, and segmented using CSS rules. For example, the left sprite allows to smoothly switch from the icon to the full logo on hover.

from `cnn.com`. CSS rules are used to crop and display only part of these images. Such image-sprites are commonly used to minimize HTTP requests, and highlight an exploitable blind-spot in some element-based perceptual ad-blockers—e.g., the logos in Figure 5 are ignored by Ad-Highlighter [75].

Images could also be fragmented into multiple elements. The ad-blocker then has to stitch them together to correctly recognize the image (e.g., Google’s AdChoices logo consists of two SVG tags). Frame- and page-based ad-blockers bypass this issue by operating on rendered content.

The rules used by ad-blockers to link ad-disclosures to ads can also be targeted. For example, on pages with an integrated ad network, such as Facebook, the publisher could place ad-disclosures (i.e., “Sponsored” links) and ads at arbitrary places in the DOM and re-position them using CSS.

**Over-segmentation Attack.** (S2) Here the publisher injects a large number of elements into the DOM (say, by generating dummy images in JavaScript) to overwhelm an ad-blocker’s classifier with inputs and exhaust its resources. In response, ad-blockers would have to aggressively filter DOM elements—with the risk of these filters’ blind spots being exploited to evade or detect ad-blocking. The viability of this attack is unclear, as users might blame publishers for high page-load latencies resulting from an overloaded perceptual ad-blocker.

## 4.3 Attacks on Classification

The ad-blocker’s classification step performs the actual visual detection of ads or ad-identifiers. The robustness of this step is key to the ad-blocker’s security. *False negatives* result in ads being shown, and *false positives* cause non-ads to be blocked.

Both error types can be exploited using *adversarial examples* [29, 76]—near-imperceptibly perturbed inputs that target a classifier’s blind spots. Adversarial examples can be used to generate perturbed web contents that fool the ad-blocker’s classifier, without affecting the user’s browsing experience.

We give concrete attacks in the next section. We consider four types of attacks: (C1) *adversarial honeypots* (misclassified non-ad elements, to detect ad-blocking); (C2) *adversarial ad-disclosures* that evade detection; (C3) *adversarial ads* that evade detection; (C4) *adversarial non-ad content* that alters the classifier’s output on nearby ads.

To mount an attack (i.e., perturb the classifier’s input), adversaries are limited by the parts of a website that they control. For example, ad networks can only perturb ads and ad-disclosures. In turn, publishers can make arbitrary website changes but cannot alter ads loaded in cross-origin `iframes`.

For element- and frame-based perceptual ad-blockers, each classifier input is usually controlled by one entity. For page-based ad-blockers, however, the classifier’s input is an image of the full rendered web page—which adversaries can only perturb in specific areas that they control. As such, attacks on page-based models come with novel challenges for digital image classifiers. Adversarial examples need to satisfy structural constraints of the underlying HTML document, and be robust to content changes outside of the adversary’s control. We solve this latter constraint by re-purposing techniques developed for physical-world adversarial examples, which create perturbations robust to random transformations [26, 43, 69].

A further challenge is the deployment of such attacks at scale, as creating perturbations for every ad served on every website could be intractable. Universal adversarial examples [52] are a natural solution to this problem. These are *single* perturbations that are crafted so as to be effective when applied to most (if not all) of a classifier’s inputs.

Attacks on page-based ad-blockers have unique constraints, but also enable novel exploits. Indeed, as a page-based classifier produces outputs based on a single full-page input, perturbing the content controlled by the attacker could affect *all* the classifier’s outputs, even on unperturbed page regions. The effectiveness of such attacks depends on the classifier. For the YOLOv3 [67] model used by Sentinel [9], we show that publishers can perturb website content near ad `iframes` so as to fool the classifier into missing the actual ads.

#### 4.4 Attacks against Ad-Blocker Actions

Ad-blockers typically run at a higher privilege level than any web page. Details vary by implementation, but ad-blockers are generally not affected by the same-origin policy and can read and write any part of any web page that the user visits.

The main privileged action taken by any ad-blocker is altering of web content. Attackers exploit this action when using honeypots to reveal the ad-blocker’s presence. But triggering ad-blocking can have more pernicious effects. Figure 1 shows an attack on a page-based model wherein a malicious content creator (e.g., an advertiser or a social network user) crafts content that tricks the ad-blocker into blocking other parts of the web page for all its users. This attack hijacks the ad-blocker’s high privilege to bypass web-security boundaries (A1).

## 5 Adversarial Examples for Perceptual Ad-Blockers

We now present concrete attacks against the perceptual ad-blocker’s *visual classifier*. Our attacks imperceptibly perturb various web page elements (i.e., ad disclosures, ads, and other content) to enable publishers, ad networks and advertisers to evade and detect perceptual ad-blocking with near 100% success rates, and without affecting user experience. We build attacks targeting the full range of perceptual ad-blocker designs,

i.e., element-based, frame-based and page-based approaches.

Our attacks are the first to apply adversarial examples [76] to a concrete web-security task. The Web context introduces novel challenges. For example, adversarial perturbations have to be encoded in the subset of HTML that the adversary has control over, and should be easy to deploy at scale across websites and ads. We also show how adversarial examples for perceptual ad-blockers can infringe on existing web-security boundaries, by enabling malicious content from one user to affect that ad-blocker’s actions over other users’ content.

In this section, we give the ad-blocker extra power and assume that it can perfectly parse the DOM inputs and block detected ads. As we discussed, these are non-trivial tasks, but we will assume that the ad-blocker is able to do them. Even so, we show that the core visual classifier is vulnerable to false positive and false negative attacks.

### 5.1 Methodology

**Classifiers.** We evaluate *six* different ad-classifiers listed in Table 2. Three are element-based, two frame-based, and one page-based. These classifiers are taken from or inspired by prior work and deployed perceptual ad-blockers. Two are used in Ad-Highlighter [74, 75] (fuzzy hashing and OCR). Two are object detector networks with the same architecture as Sentinel [9, 57], that detect either ad-disclosures in frames, or ads in a full web page. We also include an ad-classification ML model from [36], and a robust feature matcher, SIFT [47].

For classifiers that target ad-disclosures, we focus on the task of detecting the AdChoices logo. For template-matching approaches (fuzzy hashing and SIFT) we take as templates the set of 12 AdChoices logos used in Ad-Highlighter [75].

**Evaluation Data.** We use real website data to evaluate the accuracy and robustness of our six classifiers. We built an evaluation set from the top ten news websites in the Alexa ranking (see Table 4). For each website, we extract the following data:

1. All images smaller than 50KB in the DOM. This data is used to evaluate element-based techniques. We collect 864 images, 41 of which are AdChoices logos (17/41 logos contain the “AdChoices” text in addition to the icon).
2. A screenshot of each `iframe` in the DOM tree, which we use to evaluate frame-based models. We collect 59 frames. Of these, 39 are ads and 29 contain an AdChoices logo.
3. Two screenshots per website (the front-page and an article) taken in Google Chrome on a 1920 × 1080 display. These are used to evaluate page-based models. Each screenshot contains 1 or 2 fully visible ads, with 30 ads in total.

To verify that the six classifiers do indeed work, we report their accuracy in Table 2. For completeness, we add a simple blacklist classifier that searches for images that exactly match one of the 12 AdChoices logos used in Ad-Highlighter. As posited by Storey et al. [74], this approach is insufficient.

Note that the datasets above are incomparable. Some ads are not in `iframes`, or have no ad-disclosure. Many images

Table 2: **Evaluation of Ad-Classifiers.** For each classifier, we first evaluate on “benign” data collected from websites. We report false-positives (FP)—mis-classified non-ad content—and false negatives (FN)—ad-content that the classifier missed. We then give the the attack model(s) considered when *evading* the classifier, the success rate, and the corresponding section.

| Category      | Method         | Targets                        | Benign Eval. |       | Adversarial Eval.   |         |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------|---|---------|
|               |                |                                | FP           | FN    | Attack Model for Evasion  | Success |
| Element-based | Blacklist      | AdChoices logos                | 0/824        | 33/41 | N.A.  | -       |
|               | Avg. hash [74] | AdChoices logos                | 3/824        | 3/41  | Add $\leq 3$ empty rows/cols  | 100%    |
|               | SIFT           | textual AdChoices              | 2/824        | 0/17  | $\ell_2 \leq 1.5$   | 100%    |
|               | OCR [74]       | textual AdChoices              | 0/824        | 1/17  | $\ell_2 \leq 2.0$   | 100%    |
| Frame-based   | YOLOv3         | AdChoices in iframe            | 0/20         | 5/29  | $\ell_\infty \leq 4/255$  | 100%    |
|               | ResNet [36]    | ad in iframe                   | 0/20         | 21/39 | $\ell_\infty \leq 2/255$  | 100%    |
| Page-based    | YOLOv3         | ads visible in page screenshot | 2            | 6/30  | Publisher: universal full-page mask (99% transparency)                  | 100%    |
|               |                |                                |              |       | Publisher: adv. content below ads on BBC.com, $\ell_\infty \leq 3/255$  | 100%    |
|               |                |                                |              |       | Ad network: universal mask for ads on BBC.com, $\ell_\infty \leq 4/255$ | 95%     |

are only visible after scrolling and do not appear in screenshots. Therefore, the accuracy of the classifiers is also incomparable. This does not matter, as we do not aim to find the best ad-classifier, but to show that *all* visual ad-blockers can be circumvented in the stringent attack model they operate in.

When reporting performance numbers for a classifier, we use an Intel Core i7-6700 Skylake Quad-Core 3.40GHz.

**Attack Model.** We consider adversaries that use adversarial examples to produce *false-negatives* (to evade ad-blocking) or *false-positives* (honeypots to detect ad-blocking) in a white-box classifier. These are attacks C1-C4 in Table 1.

- *False negative.* To evade ad-blocking, publishers, ad networks or advertisers can perturb any web content they control, but aim to make their attacks imperceptible. We consider perturbations with small  $\ell_2$  or  $\ell_\infty$  norm (for images with pixels normalized to  $[0, 1]$ )—a sufficient condition for imperceptibility. An exception to the above are our attacks on average hashing, which is by design invariant to small  $\ell_p$  changes but highly vulnerable to other imperceptible variations. The attack model used for all evasion attacks are summarized in Table 2.
- *False positive.* The space of non-disruptive false positive attacks is vast. We focus on one easy-to-deploy attack, that generates near-uniform rectangular blocks that blend into the page’s background yet falsely trigger the ad-detector.

We assume the publisher controls the page’s HTML and CSS, but cannot access the content of ad frames. This content, including the AdChoices logo, is added by the ad network.

## 5.2 Attacks on Element-Based Ad-Blockers

For all AdChoices logos in our evaluation set, we show attacks that construct perturbed logos that are indistinguishable from the originals, yet are not recognized by element-based ad-blockers built upon average hashing, OCR or SIFT [47]. Examples of adversarial logos are in Table 3. Our attacks either pad the logo with transparent pixels (to evade average hashing), or add small  $\ell_2$  noise (for OCR and SIFT). We also construct adversarial false-positives (bottom row in Table 3),

that are classified as ad-disclosures and that a publisher can hide within a page’s background to detect ad-blockers.<sup>1</sup>

Below, we give more details on each element-based classifier (average hashing, OCR and SIFT) and on our attacks.

**Template Matching with Average Hashing.** To detect the AdChoices logo, Storey et al. [74] use *perceptual hashes* that produce similar values for perceptually close inputs. Ad-Highlighter uses *average hashing*: It first resizes input images to  $25 \times 25$  pixels. The  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry in the binary hash is 1 if the  $i^{\text{th}}$  pixel is above the mean pixel value. Two images match if their hashes have a Hamming distance below  $0.2 \cdot 25^2$ .

*Accuracy.* On our evaluation set, average hashing matches 38/40 of the AdChoices logos. The false-negatives are two copies of the image-sprite in Figure 5 (left). Average hash is fast (4 ms per image) but incurs three false-positives (a recurrent issue raised by Ad-Highlighter users [75]).

*Attack Details.* For all logos in our evaluation set, we evade average hashing by adding up to 3 transparent rows and columns to the logo. When overlaid on an ad, the rendered content is identical. Our attacks do not use  $\ell_p$  noise, as average hashing is robust to it (e.g., if  $\|\delta\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ , only pixels within  $2\epsilon$  of the mean can modify the hash if perturbed). This comes at the cost of high sensitivity to other perturbations, e.g., translations.

False-positives for average hashing are trivial. Given a hash  $H$  and a color  $c > 1$ , we create an image  $x$  where  $x_i = c + H_i - 1$ . This image is near-constant and hashes to  $H$ .

**Template Matching with SIFT.** We suggest a more robust template-matching model using *feature detectors*, i.e., algorithms that extract relevant features from images such as corners or edges. We use SIFT [47], which detects “keypoints” in images and matches images with many common keypoints.

<sup>1</sup>Ad-disclosure laws mandate that ads be identifiable by *humans*. Visually indistinguishable adversarial cues do fulfill this goal. Although the DAA has restrictions on alterations to the AdChoices logo [23], we found 19 clearly different logo variants among 41 logos we collected from ten highly visited websites (see Figure 2, (c))—indicating a lack of adherence to this rule. Moreover, adversarial *false-positives*—images ignored by users yet classified as ad-disclosures—are not bound by any regulations.



Table 3: **Adversarial Examples for Element-Based Classifiers.** These correspond to attacks (C1) and (C2) in Table 1.

| Original                | Avg. Hash                | OCR                                 | SIFT                     |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                         |                          |                                     |                          |
|                         |                          |                                     |                          |
|                         |                          |                                     |                          |
| <b>False Positives:</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SIFT has difficulties with very small images, so we resize inputs to at least 120px, and only detect the textual version of the AdChoices logo. We declare a match if an image’s keypoints match over 20% of the keypoints of one template.

*Accuracy.* SIFT matches all 17 textual AdChoices logos in our dataset, with two false positives. Matching all images for our most complex website takes 4 seconds (30ms per image).

*Attack Details.* Table 3 shows perturbed logos that match less than 5% of keypoints in all templates, with a perturbation  $\|\delta\|_2 \leq 1.5$ . Also shown is a near-white image that matches over 50% of keypoints with the original logo, with  $\|\delta\|_2 \leq 1$ .

As SIFT has no learnable parameters, the standard attack paradigm of minimizing the model’s training-loss function does not apply [76]. But it is not hard to formulate a mostly continuous loss function  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SIFT}}(x + \delta)$  as a proxy for the number of matched keypoints. The difficulty is in differentiating this loss function (defined below), as SIFT has many discrete steps. We thus make use of black-box optimization [37, 68] to approximate gradients and then use a standard attack [17].

A keypoint output by SIFT is a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{132}$ —four positional values, and a 128-dimensional *keypoint descriptor* [47]. Let  $t$  be a template with keypoint descriptors  $T$ . To match an image  $x$  against  $t$ , SIFT computes descriptor vectors for  $x$ , denoted  $\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ . Then, for each  $v_i$  it finds the distances  $d_{i,1}, d_{i,2}$  to its two nearest neighbors in  $T$ . The keypoint  $v_i$  is a match if the *ratio test*  $d_{i,1}/d_{i,2} < \tau$  holds (where  $\tau = 0.6$ ). Let  $M(x, t)$  be the keypoints of  $x$  that match with  $t$ . To evade detection, we minimize the size of  $M$  via the following proxy loss:  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SIFT}}(x + \delta) := \sum_{v_i \in M_\tau(x, t)} d_{i,2}/d_{i,1}$ . Minimizing  $\mathcal{L}$  increases  $d_{i,1}/d_{i,2}$  for some matched keypoints until they fall below the ratio test. To create false positives, we minimize an analogous loss that sums over  $v_i \notin M_\tau(x, t)$  and decreases the ratio.

**Optical Character Recognition.** Some ad-disclosures (e.g., the AdChoices logo) contain text.<sup>2</sup> To detect this text in an image, Ad-Highlighter [75] uses the Tesseract OCR system [7]. We use a TensorFlow port of Tesseract’s neural network [72]. As in Ad-Highlighter, we match an image if the edit-distance between the OCR output and “AdChoices” is below 5.

*Accuracy.* OCR detects 16/17 of the textual AdChoices logos,

<sup>2</sup>If this text were standard HTML, detection would be easy, if not for DOM segmentation attacks. For instance, Pro Publica reported that Facebook obfuscates the text in its “Sponsored” links to defeat ad transparency tools [50] (see Figure 10 for an example). An escalation of this arms race could see Facebook replacing the text of Sponsored links with images.

with no false positives. The one error is a logo with faint text that fails to parse. An issue with OCR is its performance (it is disabled by default in Ad-Highlighter). Our model parses an image in 100 ms, a 14 second delay for one of our websites.

*Attack Details.* For all logos in our evaluation set, our attacks use projected gradient descent (PGD) to create adversarial logos that decode to a string more than 5 edits away from “AdChoices”, and satisfy  $\|\delta\|_2 \leq 2$ . These are thus ignored by Ad-Highlighter. For false-positives, we start from a black image, and use PGD to produce an input transcribed as “dchoices” (edit distance of 1), with an  $\ell_2$  norm of 2 (see Table 3). Our attacks borrow from prior work by Song and Shmatikov [72].

Tesseract’s sequential neural network splits images into  $n$  frames and outputs a matrix  $Y$ , where  $Y_{i,j}$  is the confidence that the  $i^{\text{th}}$  frame contains the  $j^{\text{th}}$  character of the alphabet (an alphanumeric character or an “empty” token). The transcription is obtained by selecting the most confident token for each frame and removing sequential duplicates and empty tokens.

To get the model to mis-transcribe the text in an AdChoices logo, we penalize all correctly decoded characters. Let  $t_i = \arg \max_j Y_{i,j}$  be the most confident token for frame  $i$  and let  $b_i$  be a bit that is set if this token does not increase the edit distance. We then minimize  $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i \cdot t_i$  using an  $\ell_2$ -norm attack of Carlini and Wagner [17]. Alternatively, to generate false-positives, we first pick a sequence of tokens that decodes to “AdChoices” and then maximize that sequence’s probability.

*A Note on CAPTCHAs.* Transcribing perturbed AdChoices logos bares similarities to CAPTCHA solving. As ML models can solve CAPTCHAs [15, 84], one may wonder why reading ad disclosures is harder. The difference lies in the stronger threat model that ad-blockers face. Indeed, CAPTCHA creators have no access to the ML models they aim to fool, and must thus craft universally hard perturbations. Attacking an ad-blocker is much easier as its internal model must be public. Moreover the ad-blocker must also prevent false positives—which CAPTCHA solvers do not need to consider—and operate under stricter real-time constraints on consumer hardware.

### 5.3 Attacks on Frame-Based Ad-Blockers

We now show attacks against frame-based ad-blockers. These attacks extend the reach of perturbations to entire HTML iframes. We perturb either a frame’s ad content or ad-disclosures to evade detection. We also show attacks that create opaque honeypot frames that are mistakenly recognized as ads, and which are easily hidden in a page (see Figure 6).

Below, we describe two frame-based ML models, and our attacks on them. The first classifier extends the ideas of element-based ad-blockers by detecting the AdChoices logo in raw ad images, using a model similar to Sentinel [9]. The second model was trained by Hussain et al. [36], and showed promising results in distinguishing images of ads and non-ads.

**Object Detection for Identifying Ad Disclosures.** Detecting ad-disclosure cues embedded in ad frames was not con-




Figure 6: **Adversarial Examples for Frame-based Classifiers.** These are attacks (C1) and (C3) in Table 1. Top: Attacks on a YOLOv3 model that detects the AdChoices logo. Bottom: attacks on the ad-classifier from [36].

considered in prior work. We trained an object-detector network for this task—using the same YOLOv3 [67] architecture as Sentinel [9]. The model was trained on a dataset of 6,320 ads from Hussain et al. [36]—half of which were overlaid with an AdChoices logos in an image corner, with some randomized padding. The model is trained to predict the position of the logo, if present. We then classify an `iframe` as an ad, if the model detects the AdChoices logo in it. The model achieves 99% accuracy on this task (at 100% precision) for a held-out test set constructed the same way as the training set.

**Accuracy.** On our evaluation set of 59 `iframes`, the model achieves 100% precision and 83% recall (an AdChoices icon is correctly found in 24/29 frames). The model classifies a frame in about 650 ms, or 1-7 seconds for all frames in a page.

**Attack Details.** We use PGD to perturb all ad frames in our evaluation set with small noise ( $\ell_\infty = 4/255$ ), so that the model fails to detect an AdChoices logo. We also create near-blank images ( $\ell_\infty = 4/255$ ) wherein the model detects an AdChoices logo, see Figure 6 (top).

Recall that YOLOv3 outputs an object prediction if the box confidence—denoted  $\text{conf}(f(x+\delta), b)$ —is larger than a threshold  $\tau$ . To cause the AdChoices logo to be undetected, we thus minimize the following loss which causes all boxes to have confidence below  $\tau - \kappa$ , for some slack  $\kappa > 0$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FN}}(x+\delta) := \sum_{1 \leq b \leq B} \max(\text{conf}(f(x+\delta), b) - \kappa, 0), \quad (1)$$

For false-positives, i.e., a fake object prediction, we instead increase all boxes’ confidence up to  $\tau + \kappa$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FP}}(x+\delta) := \sum_{1 \leq b \leq B} \max(\kappa - \text{conf}(f(x), b), 0). \quad (2)$$

**Ad Classification.** Hussain et al. [36] trained a neural network on Google images labeled by humans, for the task of classifying images as containing ads or not.

**Accuracy.** We evaluate this model on 59 frames and get 100% precision but poor recall (only 18/39 detected ads). The

model does detect some ads with no disclosure cues and could thus complement models that only detect the AdChoices logo. At 380 ms per image, it is nearly twice as fast than YOLOv3.

**Attack Details.** This model is a standard feed-forward classifier, which outputs a confidence score for the image’s ad-relatedness. Using PGD, we perturbed all ad frames in our evaluation set (with noise  $\ell_\infty \leq 2/255$ ) so as to be classified as non-ads. We also created honeypots as opaque gray boxes of dimension  $200 \times 200$  and noise  $\ell_\infty \leq 2/255$ , which are recognized as ads. Examples are in Figure 6 (bottom).

## 5.4 Attacks on Page-based Ad-Blockers

In this section we describe the implementation of a Sentinel-like page-based ad-classifier for news websites, and then showcase a variety of attacks on this type of ad-blocker:

- A publisher can use CSS to overlay the entire page content with small noise, that causes the ad-blocker to fail to detect ads. We create a *universal* noise layer that successfully evades ad-blocking on all websites we test.
- A similar universal noise layer can be used to disable an ad-blocker, by fooling it into seeing ads on the entire page.
- To detect ad-blocking, a publisher can add a page-footer that is recognized as an ad. We create a universal adversarial footer that works when deployed in any page.
- For a specific domain (BBC.com), we show how advertisers, ad networks and publishers can apply even stealthier attacks (i.e., with no use of CSS) that perturb ads and their surroundings to evade detection. We also create near-invisible honeypot elements that are detected as ads.
- Finally, we reveal an intriguing “cross-boundary blocking” attack wherein a user uploads adversarially perturbed content to a site, which causes the ad-blocker to mistakenly recognize another users’ content as ads and block it.

Our attacks are displayed in Figure 7 (universal attacks), Figure 11 (attacks on BBC.com) and Figure 1 (cross-boundary attack). Compared to prior work, we tackle novel constraints unique to the Web domain, such as creating perturbations that can be deployed using HTML and CSS, and that apply only to the subset of page elements that an adversary controls.

### 5.4.1 A Sentinel-like Ad-blocker for News Websites.

As Adblock Plus’ Sentinel model [9] is not yet released, we are unable to assess its robustness. Instead, we emulate their approach [57] to train a model that detects ads in arbitrary news websites. This broadens Sentinel’s original scope (which was limited to Facebook)—a decision we made due to difficulties in collecting sufficient training data from Facebook [57].

One author trained YOLOv3 [67] to locate ads in screenshots of news websites from all G20 nations. To collect a dataset of labeled ads in web screenshots, we built a web-proxy that finds ads using filter lists and highlights them in the rendered page. We increased the *diversity* of ads present



(a) **Original Page:** two ads are detected.



(b) **Attack C4-U:** The publisher overlays a transparent mask over the full page to evade the ad-blocker.



(c) **Attack C4-U':** The publisher overlays a mask on the page to generate unreasonably large boxes and disable the ad-blocker.



(d) **Attack C1-U:** The publisher adds an opaque footer to detect an ad-blockers that blocks the honeypot element (bottom-left).

Figure 7: **Universal Adversarial Examples for Page-Based Ad-Blockers.** Displays examples of evasion attack C4-U and detection attack C1-U on a page from [theguardian.com](http://theguardian.com). Best viewed with 2x zoom in.

in our data by replacing duplicate ads with a larger variety of examples. We collected 5,585 screenshots, and used half for training and half as validation. The trained model achieves a promising F1 Score of 0.96 on the validation set. More details about this process, of independent interest, are in Appendix B.

**Accuracy.** We re-evaluated the model on 20 real web screenshots. The model misses very small ads ( $< 100\text{px}$  in height). This was an omission in our training data and we ignore these hereafter. Of 30 remaining ads, 24 (80%) are successfully detected. The model has two false-positives—a stock-price widget and a native video. Albeit imperfect, our model demonstrates the possibility of ad-detection on arbitrary websites, and is used as a reference for evaluating our attacks.

YOLOv3 processes pages downsized to  $416 \times 416\text{px}$  at 1.5 frames-per-second (on CPU), which may suffice for ad-blocking. A video of our model in action on five websites not seen during training is available at [https://www.dropbox.com/sh/pe7tj6mwcyhcd8/AAC12wPVZ8xttG34\\_aPupEd7a](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/pe7tj6mwcyhcd8/AAC12wPVZ8xttG34_aPupEd7a). We will release our model, which may find applications in non-adversarial settings (e.g., measurement studies on online ads).

## 5.4.2 Attacks

We present a collection of attacks on our Sentinel-like ad-blocker. To ensure a fair evaluation, separate authors designed these attacks independently from the model training.

We assume adversaries that control only parts of a page’s content (e.g., ad networks only control ad frames). Adversarial perturbations must thus be robust to arbitrary changes in other entities’ content. Moreover, for economies of scale, we aim

to craft perturbations that work across many websites and ads combinations (e.g., a news publisher can re-use the same perturbation for all its articles). To create adversarial examples under these novel constraints, we combine universal [52] and transformation-robust [27, 43, 69] attacks.

We first collect datasets of website screenshots.  $D^{\text{train}}$  is a set of 200 screenshots of news websites, and  $D^{\text{eval}}$  contains the 20 screenshots collected in Section 5.1 (no website or ad appears in both sets or in the ad-blocker’s training data). We also collect  $D_{\text{BBC}}^{\text{train}}$  and  $D_{\text{BBC}}^{\text{eval}}$  with 180 and 20 screenshots from [bbc.com/sports](http://bbc.com/sports). The training sets are used to create perturbations that work for arbitrary websites or ads. We measure attacks’ success rates on the evaluation sets.

We craft an adversarial perturbation  $\delta$  by minimizing  $\sum_{x \in D^{\text{train}}} \mathcal{L}(x \odot \delta)$ , where  $x \odot \delta$  denotes the act of applying the perturbation  $\delta$  to a page  $x$ . Depending on the attack, the perturbation is added pixel-wise to a page region that the adversary controls, or directly overlays that region with  $\delta$ . The loss  $\mathcal{L}$  is either  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FN}}$  or  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FP}}$  (see Equations (1) and (2)).

**C4-U: Ad-Block Evasion for all Websites.** Our first attack allows publishers to evade ad-blocking on their websites. Surprisingly maybe, we show that a publisher can perturb the full web page (including ad iframes) at a pixel level using CSS techniques. The HTML perturbation is a *near-transparent mask*, that is overlaid on the entire web page (see Figure 8). The CSS properties *z-index* and *pointer-events* are used to display the mask over all other web content, but allow underlying elements to still be accessed and clicked normally.

At opacity  $\alpha$ , the rendered page is given by  $x \odot \delta = (1 -$

```

<div id="overlay"></div>

#overlay {
  background-image: url("data:image/png;base64,...");
  width: 100%; height: 100%; top: 0; left: 0;
  position: fixed; z-index: 10000; pointer-events: none;
  opacity: 0.01; }

```

Figure 8: **Code for Attack C4-U.** An adversarial mask is tiled over the full page with a small opacity factor.

$\alpha) \cdot x + \alpha \cdot \delta$ , where  $\delta$  is the mask and  $x$  the page content. Adding a single mask over the full image is prohibitive, as the mask grows large in size and is tied to a fixed resolution. We thus build a smaller mask and *tile* it over the full page.

We find  $\delta$  by minimizing  $\sum_{x \in D^{\text{train}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FN}}(0.99 \cdot x + 0.01 \cdot \delta)$ . The adversarial mask is 20KB in size, and evades detection of all ads in  $D^{\text{eval}}$  (see Figure 7, top right). This attack is fully *universal*: it can be deployed by *any* publisher, and evades all ads. We tested this mask in Google Chrome (see Figure 8) and found it to be robust to scrolling and viewport changes.

Figure 7 (bottom-left) shows a similar evasion attack which *disables* the ad-blocker. Here, the transparent mask causes obviously incorrect predictions, thus coercing the ad-blocker into abdicating or breaking the site. We minimize  $\sum_{x \in D^{\text{train}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FP}}$ , so as to generate many box predictions. On all websites in the evaluation set, this causes the model to predict abnormally large boxes or fail to detect real ads.

**C1-U: Ad-Block Detection for all Websites.** To detect ad-blocking, a publisher can inject honeypots—false-positives in the ad-classifier—and check for DOM changes. We create a universal attack that can be used by any publisher, by adding a small black *footer*  $\delta$  at the bottom of the page, which minimizes  $\sum_{x \in D^{\text{train}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FP}}(x \odot \delta)$  (see Figure 7, bottom-right).

This attack requires slightly larger perturbations ( $\ell_\infty \leq 32$ ), as the model has a low prior for ads at the page bottom. The footer causes false predictions for 19/20 pages in  $D^{\text{eval}}$ , and is robust to a user scrolling over the page.

**C4: Ad-Block Evasion on BBC.com.** The above attacks are powerful and can be re-used by any publisher. Yet, ad-blockers might try to detect certain CSS tricks and disable them.

We now consider stealthier attacks tuned to a single domain. We use pages on [BBC.com](http://BBC.com), which have an ad banner below the page header. Our first attack, by the publisher, perturbs the white background (20px in height,  $\ell_\infty \leq 3/255$ ) below the ad. The perturbation is created by minimizing  $\sum_{x \in D^{\text{train}}_{\text{BBC}}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{YOLO}}^{\text{FN}}$  and evades all ads on [BBC.com](http://BBC.com) (see Figure 11 (b)).

Our second attack, from the ad network, creates a single perturbation ( $\ell_\infty \leq 4/255$ ) that can be reused for all ads displayed on [BBC.com](http://BBC.com), and evades the ad-blocker in 19/20 cases.

**C1: Ad-Block Detection on BBC.com.** Ad-block detection can also be made stealthier by tuning attacks to a given domain. On [BBC.com](http://BBC.com), the publisher can add a small perturbation (50px in height,  $\ell_\infty \leq 4/255$ ) to the page’s header to cause a false prediction in all articles in  $D^{\text{eval}}_{\text{BBC}}$ , see Figure 11 (c).

**A1: Cross-Boundary Blocking.** Our final attack for page-based ad-blockers is also the most intriguing and severe one. In this attack (see Figure 1) a malicious user (Jerry) uploads adversarial content that triggers a Sentinel-like ad-blocker into marking content of another user (Tom) as an ad. This “cross-boundary blocking attack” hijacks the ad-blocker’s elevated privilege to bypass web security boundaries.

To mount the attack, we optimally perturb Jerry’s content so as to maximize the model’s confidence in a box that covers Tom’s content. The attack works because object-detector models such as YOLOv3 [67] predict bounding boxes by taking into account the *full* input image—a *design feature* which increases accuracy and speed [65]. As a result, adversarial content can affect bounding boxes in arbitrary image regions. Our attack reveals an inherent vulnerability of *any* object detector applied to web content—wherein the model’s segmentation misaligns with web-security boundaries.

## 6 Discussion

We have presented multiple attacks to evade, detect and abuse recently proposed and deployed perceptual ad-blockers. We now provide an in-depth analysis of our results.

**A New Arms Race.** The aim of our work is not to downplay the merits of ad-blocking, nor discredit the premise of perceptual ad-blocking, which is sound given a robust visual ad-detector. Rather, our goal is to highlight the vulnerabilities that arise in building ad-blockers with *current* computer vision systems. Perceptual ad-blockers inherit a crucial weakness of current visual classifiers—adversarial examples [29, 76].

The past years have seen considerable work by the ML and security communities towards mitigating the threat of adversarial examples. Yet, defenses are either broken by improved attacks [10, 17], or limited to restricted adversaries [40, 48, 64]. Accordingly, we argue that as of now, using visual classifiers to detect ads merely replaces one arms race—centered on ad filter lists—to a new one centered on adversarial examples.

**Strategic Advantage of Adversaries.** Our attacks are not a *quid pro quo* step in this new arms race, but indicate a pessimistic outcome for perceptual ad-blocking. Indeed, these ad-blockers operate in essentially *the worst threat model for visual classifiers*. Their adversaries have access to the ad-blockers’ code and prepare offline digital adversarial examples to trigger both false-negatives and false-positives in the ad-blocker’s online (and time constrained) decision making.

Even if ad-blockers obfuscate their code, black-box attacks [37] or model stealing [58, 78] still apply, as the adversary can run the ad-blocker. Randomizing predictions or deploying multiple classifiers is similarly ineffective [10, 33].

The severity of the above threat model is apparent when considering existing defenses to adversarial examples. For instance, works on adversarial training [29, 40, 48, 77] assume restricted adversaries (e.g., limited to  $\ell_\infty$  perturbations), and

break under other attacks [25]. Vulnerability to false positives (or “garbage examples” [29]) has not yet been addressed.

*Detecting* adversarial examples [30, 51] (also an unsolved problem [16]) is not sufficient for ad-blockers. Ad-blockers face both adversarial false-positives and false-negatives, so merely detecting an attack does not aid in decision-making.

Section 4 also introduced attacks such as data poisoning, DOM obfuscation or resource exhaustion. These are orthogonal to classification robustness, and present further challenges for perceptual ad-blockers beyond adversarial examples.

This stringent threat model also applies to ML-based ad-blockers that use URL and DOM features [13, 32, 39], which have not been evaluated against *adaptive white-box* attacks.

### Perceptual Ad-Blocking as a Complement to Filter Lists.

Instead of replacing current filter lists, perceptual approaches could also complement them (e.g., as envisioned in Adblock Plus [6]). For example, filter lists could be prepended to the perceptual pipeline, to address secondary ad-blocker goals (bandwidth savings or anti-tracking) and reduce a perceptual model’s false positives. Perceptual ad-blocking could also be used “passively” to aid in the maintenance of filter lists, by merely logging potential new ads that filter lists miss.

In either case, our attacks still apply. Ad-blockers that combine filter lists and perceptual techniques are vulnerable to attacks targeting either technique. If perceptual models are only used passively, the ad-blocker’s adversaries still have incentive to attack to delay the detection of new ads.

**Beyond the Web and Vision.** Perceptual ad-blocking has been considered outside the Web, e.g., AdblockRadio detects ads in radio streams using neural networks [2]. Its radio client continuously classifies short audio segments as speech, music or ads based on spectral characteristics. When ads are detected, the radio lowers the volume or switches stations.

Radio ad-blockers face a different threat model than on the Web. All content, including ads, is served as raw audio from a single origin, so filter lists are useless. The publisher cannot run any client-side code, so ad-block detection is also impossible. Yet, the threat of adversarial examples does apply.

As a proof-of-concept, we created adversarial  $l_\infty$ -bounded noise for one minute of ad content in AdblockRadio’s demo podcast. The perturbed audio stream evades ad detection with a signal-to-noise ratio of 37 dB, i.e., near-inaudible.

## 7 Related Work

Our work bridges two areas of computer security research—studies of the online ad-ecosystem and associated ad-blocking arms-race, and adversarial examples for ML models.

**Behavioral Advertising.** A 2015 study found that 22% of web users use ad-blockers, mainly due to intrusive behavior [41, 63, 71, 79]. The use of ad-disclosures—which some perceptual ad-blockers rely on—is rising. On the Alexa top 500 sites, the fraction of ads with an AdChoices logo has

grown from 10% to 60% in five years [34, 74]. Despite this, less than 27% of users understand the logo’s meaning [45, 79].

**Ad-Blocking.** Limitations of filter lists are well-studied [49, 81, 82]. Many new ad-blocker designs (e.g., [13, 32, 39]) replace hard-coded rules with ML models trained on similar features (e.g., markup [21] or URLs [42]). Many of these works limit their security analysis to *non-adaptive* attacks. Ours is the first to rigorously evaluate ML-based ad-blockers.

Ad-block detection has spawned an arms-race around honeypots and anti-ad-blocking scripts [53, 54, 56]. Iqbal et al. [38] and Zhu et al. [85] detect anti-ad-blocking using code analysis and differential-testing. Storey et al. [74] build *stealthy* ad-blockers that aim to hide from client-side scripts, a challenging task in current browsers.

**Adversarial Examples.** Our work is the first to apply adversarial examples in a real-world web-security context. Prior work attacked image classifiers [17, 29, 59, 76], malware [31], speech recognition [18] and others. We make use of white-box attacks on visual classifiers [17, 48], sequential models [18, 72] and object detectors [26]. We show that *black-box* attacks [37] are a generic alternative to prior attacks on SIFT [35].

Perceptual ad-blockers introduce novel challenges for adversarial examples. Perturbing HTML bares similarities to discrete domain attacks, e.g., malware detection in PDFs [73]. The ad-blocker’s inputs can also be controlled by multiple entities, a novel constraint for *digital* image classifiers which is reminiscent of *physical-world* attacks [11, 26, 27, 44, 69].

Preventing adversarial examples is an open problem. Adversarial training is a viable strategy [29, 44, 48, 77], but considers a less stringent threat model than perceptual ad-blockers.

## 8 Conclusion

We have presented a comprehensive security evaluation of perceptual ad-blocking. To understand the design space of these recently deployed systems, we have derived a unified architecture that incorporates and extends prior work. Our analysis of this architecture has revealed multiple vulnerabilities at every stage of the visual ad-classification pipeline. We have thoroughly evaluated the impact of adversarial examples on six ad-classifiers—the first application of these attacks to web-security. We have shown how to craft near-imperceptible perturbation for ads, ad-disclosures, and native content, in order to evade or detect ad-blocking. Finally, we have discovered a powerful attack on page-based ad-blockers, wherein a malicious user fools the model into blocking content supposedly protected by web-security boundaries.

Our aim was to highlight the fundamental vulnerabilities that perceptual ad-blockers inherit from existing image classifiers. As long as defenses to adversarial examples are elusive, perceptual ad-blockers will be dragged into a new arms race in which they start from a precariously disadvantaged position—given the stringent threat model that they must survive.

## References

- [1] Adblock Plus. <https://adblockplus.org/>.
- [2] Adblockradio. <https://www.adblockradio.com>.
- [3] EasyList. <https://easylist.to/>.
- [4] Easylist forum: Report incorrectly removed content. <https://forums.lanik.us/viewforum.php?f=64&sid=ba948dbdbad9334b72c143f26db58ff0>.
- [5] Ghostery. <https://www.ghostery.com/>.
- [6] Issue 7088: Implement hide-if-contains-image snippet. <https://issues.adblockplus.org/ticket/7088>.
- [7] Tesseract. <https://github.com/tesseract-ocr/>.
- [8] uBlock. <https://www.ublock.org/>.
- [9] Adblock Plus. Sentinel, 2018. <https://adblock.ai/>.
- [10] Anish Athalye, Nicholas Carlini, and David Wagner. Obfuscated gradients give a false sense of security: Circumventing defenses to adversarial examples. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [11] Anish Athalye, Logan Engstrom, Andrew Ilyas, and Kevin Kwok. Synthesizing robust adversarial examples. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [12] Shai Avidan and Ariel Shamir. Seam carving for content-aware image resizing. In *ACM Transactions on graphics*, volume 26, page 10, 2007.
- [13] Sruti Bhagavatula, Christopher Dunn, Chris Kanich, Minaxi Gupta, and Brian Ziebart. Leveraging machine learning to improve unwanted resource filtering. In *AISec*. ACM, 2014.
- [14] Battista Biggio, Blaine Nelson, and Pavel Laskov. Poisoning attacks against support vector machines. In *ICML*, 2012.
- [15] Elie Bursztein, Jonathan Aigrain, Angelika Moscicki, and John C Mitchell. The end is nigh: Generic solving of text-based captchas. In *WOOT*. USENIX, 2014.
- [16] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Adversarial examples are not easily detected: Bypassing ten detection methods. In *AISec*, pages 3–14. ACM, 2017.
- [17] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2017.
- [18] Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Audio adversarial examples: Targeted attacks on speech-to-text. In *DLS*, 2018.
- [19] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, Bo Li, Kimberly Lu, and Dawn Song. Targeted backdoor attacks on deep learning systems using data poisoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05526*, 2017.
- [20] Nicolas Christin, Sally S Yanagihara, and Keisuke Kamataki. Dissecting one click frauds. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 15–26. ACM, 2010.
- [21] Justin Crites and Mathias Ricken. Automatic ad blocking: Improving Adblock for the Mozilla platform.
- [22] Digital Advertising Alliance (DAA). Self regulatory principles for online behavioral advertising, 2009. [https://digitaladvertisingalliance.org/sites/aboutads/files/DAA\\_files/seven-principles-07-01-09.pdf](https://digitaladvertisingalliance.org/sites/aboutads/files/DAA_files/seven-principles-07-01-09.pdf).
- [23] Digital Advertising Alliance (DAA). DAA icon ad marker creative guidelines, 2013. [https://digitaladvertisingalliance.org/sites/aboutads/files/DAA\\_files/DAA\\_Icon\\_Ad\\_Creative\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://digitaladvertisingalliance.org/sites/aboutads/files/DAA_files/DAA_Icon_Ad_Creative_Guidelines.pdf).
- [24] Benjamin Edelman. False and deceptive display ads at yahoo’s right media, 2009. <http://www.benedelman.org/rightmedia-deception/#reg>.
- [25] Logan Engstrom, Dimitris Tsipras, Ludwig Schmidt, and Aleksander Madry. A rotation and a translation suffice: Fooling CNNs with simple transformations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.02779*, 2017.
- [26] Kevin Eykholt, Ivan Evtimov, Earlene Fernandes, Bo Li, Amir Rahmati, Florian Tramèr, Atul Prakash, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Dawn Song. Physical adversarial examples for object detectors. In *WOOT*. USENIX, 2018.
- [27] Kevin Eykholt, Ivan Evtimov, Earlene Fernandes, Bo Li, Amir Rahmati, Chaowei Xiao, Atul Prakash, Tadayoshi Kohno, and Dawn Song. Robust physical-world attacks on deep learning visual classification. In *CVPR*, pages 1625–1634. IEEE, 2018.
- [28] Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Ristenpart. Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures. In *CCS*. ACM, 2015.
- [29] Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.
- [30] Kathrin Grosse, Praveen Manoharan, Nicolas Papernot, Michael Backes, and Patrick McDaniel. On the (statistical) detection of adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.06280*, 2017.
- [31] Kathrin Grosse, Nicolas Papernot, Praveen Manoharan, Michael Backes, and Patrick McDaniel. Adversarial perturbations against deep neural networks for malware classification. In *ESORICS*, 2017.
- [32] David Gugelmann, Markus Happe, Bernhard Ager, and Vincent Lenders. An automated approach for complementing ad blockers’ blacklists. *PETS*, (2):282–298, 2015.
- [33] Warren He, James Wei, Xinyun Chen, Nicholas Carlini, and Dawn Song. Adversarial example defenses: Ensembles of weak defenses are not strong. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04701*, 2017.
- [34] Jovanni Hernandez, Akshay Jagadeesh, and Jonathan Mayer. Tracking the trackers: The AdChoices icon, 2011. <http://cyberlaw.stanford.edu/blog/2011/08/tracking-trackers-adchoices-icon>.
- [35] Chao-Yung Hsu, Chun-Shien Lu, and Soo-Chang Pei. Secure and robust SIFT. In *ICM*, pages 637–640. ACM, 2009.
- [36] Zaeem Hussain, Mingda Zhang, Xiaozhong Zhang, Keren Ye, Christopher Thomas, Zuha Agha, Nathan Ong, and Adriana Kovashka. Automatic understanding of image and video advertisements. In *CVPR*, pages 1100–1110. IEEE, 2017.
- [37] Andrew Ilyas, Logan Engstrom, Anish Athalye, and Jessy Lin. Black-box adversarial attacks with limited queries and information. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [38] Umar Iqbal, Zubair Shafiq, and Zhiyun Qian. The ad wars: retrospective measurement and analysis of anti-adblock filter lists. In *IMC*, pages 171–183. ACM, 2017.
- [39] Umar Iqbal, Zubair Shafiq, Peter Snyder, Shitong Zhu, Zhiyun Qian, and Benjamin Livshits. Adgraph: A machine learning approach to automatic and effective adblocking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09155*, 2018.
- [40] Zico Kolter and Eric Wong. Provable defenses against adversarial examples via the convex outer adversarial polytope. In *ICML*, 2017.
- [41] Georgios Kontaxis and Monica Chew. Tracking protection in Firefox for privacy and performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.04104*, 2015.
- [42] Viktor Krammer. An effective defense against intrusive web advertising. In *Conference on Privacy, Security and Trust*, pages 3–14. IEEE, 2008.
- [43] Alexey Kurakin, Ian Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial examples in the physical world. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- [44] Alexey Kurakin, Ian Goodfellow, and Samy Bengio. Adversarial machine learning at scale. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- [45] Pedro Giovanni Leon, Justin Cranshaw, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Jim Graves, Manoj Hastak, Blase Ur, and Guzi Xu. What do online behavioral advertising privacy disclosures communicate to users? In *Workshop on Privacy in the electronic society*, pages 19–30. ACM, 2012.

- [46] Zhou Li, Kehuan Zhang, Yinglian Xie, Fang Yu, and XiaoFeng Wang. Knowing your enemy: understanding and detecting malicious web advertising. In *CCS*. ACM, 2012.
- [47] David G Lowe. Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints. *International journal of computer vision*, 60(2):91–110, 2004.
- [48] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [49] Matthew Malloy, Mark McNamara, Aaron Cahn, and Paul Barford. Ad blockers: Global prevalence and impact. In *IMC*, pages 119–125. ACM, 2016.
- [50] Jeremy B. Merrill and Ariana Tobin. Facebook moves to block ad transparency tools - including ours, 2019. <https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-blocks-ad-transparency-tools>.
- [51] Jan Hendrik Metzen, Tim Genewein, Volker Fischer, and Bastian Bischoff. On detecting adversarial perturbations. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- [52] Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, Omar Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. Universal adversarial perturbations. In *CVPR*, pages 1765–1773. IEEE, 2017.
- [53] Muhammad Haris Mughees, Zhiyun Qian, and Zubair Shafiq. Detecting anti ad-blockers in the wild. In *PETS*, volume 2017, pages 130–146, 2017.
- [54] Muhammad Haris Mughees, Zhiyun Qian, Zubair Shafiq, Karishma Dash, and Pan Hui. A first look at ad-block detection: A new arms race on the web. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.05841*, 2016.
- [55] Luke Mulks. Brave community: All about ad blocking, 2017. <https://community.brave.com/t/all-about-ad-blocking/10004>.
- [56] Rishab Nithyanand, Sheharbano Khattak, Mobin Javed, Narseo Vallina-Rodriguez, Marjan Falahraghegar, Julia E Powles, ED Cristofaro, Hamed Haddadi, and Steven J Murdoch. Adblocking and counter blocking: A slice of the arms race. In *USENIX Workshop on Free and Open Communications on the Internet*, 2016.
- [57] Paraska Oleksandr. Towards more intelligent ad blocking on the web, 2018. <https://medium.com/@shoniko/towards-more-intelligent-ad-blocking-on-the-web-9f67bf2a12b5>.
- [58] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Ian Goodfellow, Somesh Jha, Z Berkay Celik, and Ananthram Swami. Practical black-box attacks against machine learning. In *ASIACCS*, pages 506–519. ACM, 2017.
- [59] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Somesh Jha, Matt Fredrikson, Z Berkay Celik, and Ananthram Swami. The limitations of deep learning in adversarial settings. In *IEEE EuroS&P*, 2016.
- [60] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Arunesh Sinha, and Michael Wellman. Towards the science of security and privacy in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03814*, 2016.
- [61] Giancarlo Pellegrino, Martin Johns, Simon Koch, Michael Backes, and Christian Rossow. Deemon: Detecting csrf with dynamic analysis and property graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 1757–1771. ACM, 2017.
- [62] Giancarlo Pellegrino, Christian Rossow, Fabrice J Ryba, Thomas C Schmidt, and Matthias Wählisch. Cashing out the great cannon? on browser-based ddos attacks and economics. In *WOOT*, 2015.
- [63] Enric Pujol, Oliver Hohlfeld, and Anja Feldmann. Annoyed users: Ads and ad-block usage in the wild. In *IMC*, pages 93–106. ACM, 2015.
- [64] Aditi Raghunathan, Jacob Steinhardt, and Percy Liang. Certified defenses against adversarial examples. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [65] Joseph Redmon, Santosh Kumar Divvala, Ross B. Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *CVPR*, pages 779–788. IEEE, 2016.
- [66] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. YOLO9000: better, faster, stronger. In IEEE, editor, *CVPR*, pages 6517–6525, 2017.
- [67] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.02767*, 2018.
- [68] Tim Salimans, Jonathan Ho, Xi Chen, Szymon Sidor, and Ilya Sutskever. Evolution strategies as a scalable alternative to reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03864*, 2017.
- [69] Mahmood Sharif, Sruti Bhagavatula, Lujo Bauer, and Michael K Reiter. Accessorize to a crime: Real and stealthy attacks on state-of-the-art face recognition. In *CCS*, pages 1528–1540. ACM, 2016.
- [70] Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Membership inference attacks against machine learning models. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 3–18. IEEE, 2017.
- [71] Ashish Kumar Singh and Vidyasagar Potdar. Blocking online advertising—a state of the art. In *ICIT*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2009.
- [72] Congzheng Song and Vitaly Shmatikov. Fooling ocr systems with adversarial text images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05385*, 2018.
- [73] Nedim Srdic and Pavel Laskov. Practical evasion of a learning-based classifier: A case study. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2014.
- [74] Grant Storey, Dillon Reisman, Jonathan Mayer, and Arvind Narayanan. The future of ad blocking: An analytical framework and new techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08568*, 2017.
- [75] Grant Storey, Dillon Reisman, Jonathan Mayer, and Arvind Narayanan. Perceptual Ad Highlighter, 2017. Chrome Extension: <https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/perceptual-ad-highlighter/mahgiff1eahghaapkb0ihnbhdplhncp>; Source code: <https://github.com/citp/ad-blocking>.
- [76] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2014.
- [77] Florian Tramèr, Alexey Kurakin, Nicolas Papernot, Ian Goodfellow, Dan Boneh, and Patrick McDaniel. Ensemble adversarial training: Attacks and defenses. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [78] Florian Tramèr, Fan Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. Stealing machine learning models via prediction apis. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2016.
- [79] Blase Ur, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Richard Shay, and Yang Wang. Smart, useful, scary, creepy: perceptions of online behavioral advertising. In *SOUPS*, page 4. ACM, 2012.
- [80] Ennèl van Eeden and Wilson Chow. Perspectives from the global entertainment & media outlook 2018–2022, 2018. <https://www.statista.com/topics/1176/online-advertising/>.
- [81] Antoine Vastel, Peter Snyder, and Benjamin Livshits. Who filters the filters: Understanding the growth, usefulness and efficiency of crowdsourced ad blocking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09160*, 2018.
- [82] Craig E Wills and Doruk C Uzunoglu. What ad blockers are (and are not) doing. In *HotWeb*, pages 72–77. IEEE, 2016.
- [83] Xinyu Xing, Wei Meng, Byoungyoung Lee, Udi Weinsberg, Anmol Sheth, Roberto Perdisci, and Wenke Lee. Understanding malvertising through ad-injecting browser extensions. In *International Conference on World Wide Web*, 2015.
- [84] Guixin Ye, Zhanyong Tang, Dingyi Fang, Zhanxing Zhu, Yansong Feng, Pengfei Xu, Xiaojiang Chen, and Zheng Wang. Yet another text captcha solver: A generative adversarial network based approach. In *CCS*. ACM, 2018.
- [85] Shitong Zhu, Xunchao Hu, Zhiyun Qian, Zubair Shafiq, and Heng Yin. Measuring and disrupting anti-adblockers using differential execution analysis. In *NDSS*, 2018.

## A Defeating Behavioral Ad-Blocking

In addition to visual cues, *behavioral features* have been proposed for perceptual ad-blocking, i.e., detecting ads by their available user interactions [74]. The main way users can interact with ad-content is by *clicking* on them. Storey et al. [74] observe that ad-identifiers (e.g., the AdChoices logo) often direct the user to a disclosure page when clicked. Ad Highlighter [75] uses such behavioral cues to detect ads on Facebook. It parses the DOM in search for links containing the text “Sponsored” (see Figure 10 (right)) and determines whether the link leads to Facebook’s ad statement page by simulating a user-click on the link and following any redirects.

These techniques are dangerous and enable serious vulnerabilities (e.g., CSRF [61], DDoS [62] or click-fraud [20]) with consequences extending beyond ad-blocking. Clicking links on a user’s behalf is a highly privileged action, which can thus be exploited by *any party that can add links in a page*, e.g., publishers, ad networks, advertisers and sometimes arbitrary website users. To illustrate the dangers of behavioral ad-blocking, we create a regular Facebook post with an URL to a web page with title “Sponsored”. Facebook converts this URL into a link which Ad Highlighter clicks on. *Albeit sound, this attack luckily and coincidentally fails due to Facebook’s Link Shim*, that inspects clicked links before redirecting the user. Ad Highlighter fails to follow this particular redirection thus inadvertently preventing the attack. Yet, this also means that Facebook could use the same layer of indirection for their “Sponsored” link. If the behavioral ad-blocking idea were to be extended to disclosure cues on other websites (e.g., the AdChoices logo), such attacks would also be easily mounted. Pre-filtering inputs passed to a behavioral layer does not help. Either the filter is perfect, in which case no extra step is required—or its false positives can be exploited to trigger the behavioral component.

## B Training a Page-Based Ad-Blocker

As the trained neural network of Sentinel [9] is not available for an evaluation, we trained one for the in-depth analysis of Section 5. We used the same neural network architecture deployed by Sentinel, i.e., YOLO (v3) [65–67].

### B.1 Data Collection

YOLO is an object detection network. Given an image, it returns a set of bounding boxes, one for each of the detected objects. To train and evaluate YOLO, we created a dataset of labeled web page screenshots where each label corresponds to coordinates and dimensions of an ad on the image. We created the dataset with an ad-hoc automated system that we created. Our system operates in two main steps. First, given a URL, it retrieves the web page and identifies the position of ads in the page using filter lists of traditional ad-blockers. Then, our system generates a web page template where ads are replaced

with placeholder boxes. The concept of web page templates is convenient as it enables us to create multiple screenshots from the same web page with different ads, a form of data-augmentation. Second, from each web page template, we derive a number of images by placing ads on the template.

**Web Pages.** We acquired web pages by retrieving the URLs of the top 30 news websites of each of the G20 nations listed in [allyoucanread.com](http://allyoucanread.com). For each news site, we searched for the RSS feed URLs and discarded sites with no RSS feeds. The total number of RSS feed URLs is 143. We visited each RSS feed URL daily and fetched the URLs to the daily news.

**Template Generation.** Given a URL of a news article, we generate a page template using a modified HTTP proxy that matches incoming HTTP requests against traditional ad-blocker filter lists, i.e., Easylist [3] and Ghostery [5]. The proxy replaces ad contents with monochrome boxes using a unique color for each ad. These boxes are placeholders that we use to insert new ads. We manually inspected all templates generated during this step to remove pages with a broken layout (caused by filter lists’ false positives) or pages whose ads are still visible (caused by filter lists’ false negatives).

**Image Generation.** From each page template, we generate multiple images by replacing placeholder boxes with ads. We select ads from the dataset of Hussain et al. [36]. This dataset contains about 64K images of ads of variable sizes and ratios. We complemented the dataset with 136 ads we retrieved online. To insert pictures inside a template, we follow four strategies:

1. We directly replace the placeholder with an ad;
2. We replace the placeholder with an ad, and we also include an AdChoices logo in the top right corner of the ad;
3. We augment a template without placeholders by adding a large ad “popup” in the web page. The website is darkened to highlight the ad;
4. We insert ads as background of the website, that fully cover the left- and right-hand margins of the page.

When inserting an ad, we select an ad image with a similar aspect ratio. When we cannot find an exact match, we resize the image using Seam Carving [12], a content-aware image resizing algorithm that minimizes image distortion. To avoid overfitting during training, we limited the number of times each ad image can be used to 20.

### B.2 Evaluation and Results

**Datasets.** The training set contains a total of 2,901 images—2,600 with ads and 301 without. 1,600 images with ads were obtained with placeholder replacement, 800 with placeholder replacements with AdChoices logos, 100 images with background ads, and 100 images with interstitials.

The evaluation set contains a total of 2,684 images—2,585 with ads and 99 without ads. These are 1,595 images with placeholder replacement, 790 images with placeholder re-





Figure 9: **Activation Maps of our Ad Detection Model.** The most salient features appear to be the surroundings of ads rather than their visual content.

placement with AdChoices logos, 100 images with background ads, and 100 images with interstitials. We also compiled a second evaluation set from 10 domains that were not used for training (this set is different from the one used to evaluate attacks in Section 5). For each domain, we took a screenshot of the front page and four screenshots of different subpages, resulting in 50 screenshots overall with a total of 75 advertisements. We trained using the default configuration of YOLOv3 [67], adapted for a unary classification task.

**Accuracy and Performance.** We tested our model against both evaluation sets. The model achieved the best results after 3,600 training iterations. In the first set, our model achieved a mean average precision of 90.88%, an average intersect of union of 84.23% and an F1-score of 0.96. On the second set, our model achieved a mean average precision of 87.28%, an average intersect of union of 77.37% and an F1-score of 0.85. A video demonstrating our model detecting ads on five never seen web sites is available at [https://www.dropbox.com/sh/pe7tjf6mwcyhcd8/AAC12wPVZ8xttG34\\_aPupEd7a](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/pe7tjf6mwcyhcd8/AAC12wPVZ8xttG34_aPupEd7a).

We evaluate performance of the model in TensorFlow 1.8.0 with Intel AVX support. On an Intel Core i7-6700 CPU the prediction for a single image took 650ms.

**Inspecting our Model.** We conduct a preliminary study of the inner-workings of our neural network. By inspecting the model’s *activation map* on different inputs (see Figure 9), we find that the model primarily focuses on the layout of ads in a page, rather than their visual content. This shows that our ad-blocker detects ads using very different visual signals than humans. This raises an intriguing question about the Sentinel model of Adblock Plus [9], which was trained solely on Facebook data, where ads are visually close to the website’s native content. Thus, it seems less likely that Sentinel would have learned to detect ads by relying mainly on layout information.

To generate the activations in Figure 9, we compute the absolute value of the gradient of the network’s output with respect to every input pixel, and apply a smoothing Gaussian kernel over the resulting image. The gradient map is then overlaid on the original input.

## C Extra Tables and Figures

Table 4: **Evaluation Data for Adversarial Examples.** We collect images, frames and screenshots from the Alexa top ten news websites that use the AdChoices standard (we exclude [news.google.com](https://news.google.com) and [shutterstock.com](https://shutterstock.com) which contain no ads on their front-page). For each page, we extract all images below 50 KB, all iframes, and take two screenshots (the front page and an article) of the user’s viewport, and report the number of visible ads in these.

| Website   | Images     |           | Iframes   |           | Visible Ads |           |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|   | Total      | AdChoices | Total     | Ads       | AdChoices   |           |
| <a href="https://reddit.com">reddit.com</a>                 | 70         | 2         | 2         | 2         | 2           | 2         |
| <a href="https://cnn.com">cnn.com</a>                       | 36         | 7         | 7         | 5         | 2           | 3         |
| <a href="https://nytimes.com">nytimes.com</a>               | 89         | 4         | 3         | 3         | 3           | 2         |
| <a href="https://theguardian.com">theguardian.com</a>       | 75         | 4         | 8         | 3         | 3           | 3         |
| <a href="https://indiatimes.com">indiatimes.com</a>         | 125        | 4         | 5         | 5         | 4           | 3         |
| <a href="https://weather.com">weather.com</a>               | 144        | 5         | 11        | 7         | 3           | 3         |
| <a href="https://news.yahoo.com">news.yahoo.com</a>         | 100        | 5         | 3         | 3         | 2           | 3         |
| <a href="https://washingtonpost.com">washingtonpost.com</a> | 40         | 1         | 5         | 2         | 1           | 3         |
| <a href="https://foxnews.com">foxnews.com</a>               | 96         | 5         | 6         | 5         | 4           | 4         |
| <a href="https://huffingtonpost.com">huffingtonpost.com</a> | 90         | 4         | 9         | 4         | 5†          | 4         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>865</b> | <b>41</b> | <b>59</b> | <b>39</b> | <b>29</b>   | <b>30</b> |

† One AdChoices logo appears in two rendered iframes laid on top of each other.







Figure 10: **CSS Obfuscation on Facebook.** (Left) HTML and CSS used by Facebook.com to obfuscate the “Sponsored” link that identifies paid-for content. When copied into a clipboard, the link reads “SpSonSsoSredS”. This is an example of a CSS Obfuscation attack (see Section 4) that mirrors measures against online *email scrapers*, an arms-race that led many web-users to render email addresses as images. As reported by ProPublica [50], Facebook recently modified its obfuscation (which now decodes as “SpSpSononSsosoSredredSSS”) and also introduced invisible honeypot “Sponsored” disclosures to non-ad content. (Right) A proof-of-concept where the “Sponsored” link is an (adversarial) image that Tesseract’s OCR decodes as “8parisared”.



(a) **Original Page:** The ad banner is correctly detected.



(b) **Attack C3-C4:** The publisher perturbs the white background beneath the ad to evade ad-blocking (C4). Alternatively, an ad network adds a universal mask on the ad (C3, not displayed here for brevity). In both cases, the perturbation is invisible to the user.



(c) **Attack C1:** The publisher adds a honeypot element to the page header (top-right) to detect an ad-blocker.

Figure 11: **Universal Adversarial Examples for Page-Based Ad-Blockers on BBC . com.** Examples of evasion attacks C3-C4 and detection attack C1 (see Section 5.4).