

Exploiting Uncommon Text-Encoded Structures for Automated Jailbreaks in LLMs

Bangxin Li*
Hengrui Xing*
School of Computer Science and
Technology, Xidian University
Xi'an, P.R. China

Chao Huang
University of Southampton
Southampton, United Kingdom

Jin Qian
School of Computer Science and
Technology, Xidian University
Xi'an, P.R. China

Huangqing Xiao
School of Computer Science and
Technology, Xidian University
Xi'an, P.R. China

Lingfeng Feng
School of Computer Science and
Technology, Xidian University
Xi'an, P.R. China

Cong Tian[†]
School of Computer Science and
Technology, Xidian University
Xi'an, P.R. China

ABSTRACT

Large Language Models (LLMs) are widely used in natural language processing but face the risk of jailbreak attacks that maliciously induce them to generate harmful content. Existing jailbreak attacks, including character-level and context-level attacks, mainly focus on the prompt of the plain text without specifically exploring the significant influence of its structure. In this paper, we focus on studying how prompt structure contributes to the jailbreak attack. We introduce a novel structure-level attack method based on tail structures that are rarely used during LLM training, which we refer to as Uncommon Text-Encoded Structure (UTES). We extensively study 12 UTESs templates and 6 obfuscation methods to build an effective automated jailbreak tool named StructuralSleight that contains three escalating attack strategies: Structural Attack, Structural and Character/Context Obfuscation Attack, and Fully Obfuscated Structural Attack. Extensive experiments on existing LLMs show that StructuralSleight significantly outperforms baseline methods. In particular, the attack success rate reaches 94.62% on GPT-4o, which has not been addressed by state-of-the-art techniques.

Content Warning: This paper contains harmful content generated by LLMs.

CCS CONCEPTS

- **Security and privacy** → **Software and application security**;
- **Computing methodologies** → **Natural language processing**.

KEYWORDS

Trustworthy machine learning, Large Language Model, Jailbreak

1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown great potential in addressing a wide variety of tasks, with specific applications including chatbots, computational biology, computer programming, etc. LLMs have attracted significant attention in academia and industry, fostering the belief that they might represent the next frontier in Artificial General Intelligence [6, 14].

However, the ability of LLMs to excel comes with inherent security risks [5], that is, their susceptibility to jailbreak attacks and

thus generation of harmful content. In software systems, jailbreak refers to hackers elevating privileges by reverse engineering the system and exploiting vulnerabilities in it [20]. For LLMs, jailbreak has been redefined through specially designed input prompts that circumvent the models' safety measures. This process leads to the production of forbidden content [9], such as detailed methods for making bombs.

Existing jailbreak methods based on prompt engineering can be categorized into two types: Character-level obfuscation and Context-level obfuscation. Character-level obfuscation employs character-level methods to obfuscate and encode harmful natural text, such as base64 and leetspeak, to achieve jailbreak in areas where secure training fails to generalize [37]. Context-level obfuscation focuses on introducing additional contextual elements to interfere with the LLM's judgment of intent, such as role-playing [1] and chain of thoughts [26]. These studies mainly focus on natural language, without specific consideration of structured prompts.

Recent studies [10, 33] show that it is yet challenging for LLMs to understand and process structured data. In addition, LLMs have been found to perform poorly on tail data[25]. Therefore, we argue that structure-level attack, specifically with uncommon (tail) structure, is an important complement to the Character-level and context-level attacks in jailbreak attack. In Figure 1, a motivational example shows structure-level attack can achieve supreme performance in specific situations.

To this end, this work conducts extensive research to explore the effectiveness of structure-level attack by not only applying it alone, but also integrating it with other attacks. We first introduce the notion of Uncommon Text-Encoded Structure (UTES) to distinguish uncommon structural prompts from plain text prompts. We specifically propose 12 different UTESs, ranging from Tree to Json. In our structure-level attack, each harmful plain text prompt will be converted to a structural one, given a specific structure. To investigate how such structure-level attack performs, we propose three progressively advanced attack modes.

- **Structural Attack (SA):** The structured jailbreak input is generated by filling the harmful prompt into a pre-defined structure template.

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

[†]Corresponding author




Figure 1: Motivating example: different query methods for jailbreaking ChatGPT. (a) Querying ChatGPT with harmful behavior; (b) Querying ChatGPT with harmful behavior that encoded in GB8030; (c) Querying ChatGPT with harmful behavior that embedded in multi-task; (d) Querying ChatGPT with harmful behavior that embedded in a structured graph template. The results demonstrate that structured harmful prompt outperforms existing obfuscation methods, which motivates us to explore structured attack in this work.

- **Structural and Character/Context Obfuscation Attack (SCA)**: We integrate Structural Attack with an existing obfuscation method, which can be either character-level or context-level.
- **Fully Obfuscated Structural Attack (FSA)**: We combine the Structural Attack, character-level obfuscation and context-level obfuscation to create a more complex attack.

Based on these three attack models, we design an automated jailbreak framework named StructuralSleight.

StructuralSleight implements 12 structure-level attacks based on the UTES, 5 character-level attacks, and 1 context-level attacks. Starting from the SA attack model, StructuralSleight evaluates the performance of each attack method and uses a greedy strategy to select the best one for the next stage to reduce the complexity. For example, for the given motivating example shown in Figure 1, Graph performs the best in the SA stage and we thus select it to integrate with other techniques in the SCA stage. Benefiting from the modular design, StructuralSleight can be further extended to new obfuscation attacks in the future.

We conduct extensive experiments with StructuralSleight over the Harmful Behaviors[43] dataset with various LLMs, i.e., GPT-4o¹, Llama3-70B², and Claude3-Opus³, against various baselines, e.g., PAIR[7], MasterKey[9], CodeAttack[25] and experimental results

demonstrate that integrating structural-level attack can significantly enhance the jailbreak success rate, illustrating structural-level attack is complementary to existing attacks.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- We comprehensively reveal that text structure is an important feature in jailbreak attacks and accordingly propose a jailbreak attack strategy based on UTES to address the shortcomings of LLM safety alignment from the text structure perspective.
- We implement StructuralSleight, an automated jailbreak framework based on UTES, which consists of three stages of attacks, including Structural Attack, Structural and Character/Context Obfuscation Attack, and Fully Obfuscated Structural Attack. A greedy method is adopted to choose the locally optimal technique for the next stage.
- We extensively evaluate the performance of StructuralSleight on various state-of-the-art LLMs, and demonstrate the effectiveness of the framework by achieving 94.62%, 92%, and 82.31% attack success rates on GPT-4o, Llama3-70B, and Claude3-Opus, respectively. An additional experiment is conducted to illustrate the contribution of Structural Attacks to the overall performance.

2 PRELIMINARIES

Jailbreak attack. We first informally explain jailbreak attacks based on prompt engineering. Harmful content refers to any text output that may cause harm to individuals or society, violate laws, or breach ethical principles and should not be produced. Existing

¹<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

²<https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>

³<https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>

LLMs utilize defense methods like data filtering to avoid responding to queries with harmful intents. A jailbreak attack against LLMs is a strategy to embellish the queries with harmful intents that can bypass LLMs' defense mechanism and induce LLMs to generate harmful content. We can categorize jailbreak attacks depending on the focused feature.

Character-level obfuscation. Character-level obfuscation[37] specifically embellishes harmful prompts at the levels of characters, words, and sentences. Attackers use encoding, replacement, etc, to change the representation of harmful behavior characters, with a specific encoding rule. In addition to the modified prompt, the encoding rule is also provided as an input such that LLMs can understand the modified prompt

Context-level obfuscation. Unlike character-level obfuscation which mainly does word replacement, context-level obfuscation[1, 26] modifies harmful prompts by adding additional contextual information to fool LLMs. This contextual information can be meaningless task flows, fictional scenarios, or special instructions.

Structure-level obfuscation – Problem Definition Our motivation comes from the observation [10, 33] that structured prompts are challenging for LLMs to understand and process. Therefore we suspect that structure is one of the key features of a prompt for LLMs to understand and should be specifically considered in jailbreak attacks. We define that *a structure-level attack is a strategy to change the structure of queries with harmful intents such that LLMs can generate the harmful response accordingly.*

The goal of this work is to investigate structure-level attacks by answering the following questions: 1) How to design a structure-level attack; 2) How is the performance of a structure-level attack when it performs individually; 3) How is the performance of a structure-level attack when it is integrated with existing character-level and/or context-level attack.

3 STRUCTURALSLEIGHT: A HYBRID FRAMEWORK INTEGRATING STRUCTURE LEVEL ATTACK

To comprehensively explore the effectiveness of Structure-level obfuscation methods in jailbreak attacks, we plan to conduct research from three perspectives. First, we will explore the effectiveness of UTES-based jailbreak attack methods alone. This study will reveal whether using only Structure-level obfuscation can achieve an effective jailbreak attack. Then, we will explore the combined effects of Structure-level obfuscation with Character-level and Context-level obfuscation methods. This level of research is based on an intuitive hypothesis: can different levels of obfuscation methods work together to produce stronger jailbreak attack effects?

Finally, we will further investigate the effect of complete combination of three levels of obfuscation methods on the attack success rate (ASR). This level of exploration will reveal the combined effect of multi-level obfuscation, which is crucial for a thorough assessment of the significance of Structure-level obfuscation.

3.1 Structure-level: UTES-based jailbreak attack

3.1.1 Design of a Structure-Level Attack. Research has shown that although LLMs perform well in handling unstructured text, they have limitations when dealing with structured text. Based on this

finding, we designed a class of jailbreaking methods. By embedding harmful behaviors into predefined structural templates and inducing LLMs to fill in content related to the harmful behaviors within these templates.

Unlike content attacks that focus on changing the content itself or the context, structure-level attacks focus on modifying the structural environment in which the harmful behavior instructions are located. This attack method exploits the weaknesses of LLMs in interpreting and processing structured data, leading to unexpected behaviors or security vulnerabilities in LLMs.

Intuitively, the structural template play a crucial role in this attack. Carefully selecting and designing these templates makes it more likely to deceive LLMs, thereby achieving the intended attack effect. Next, we will introduce how to select and design these templates that are more likely to deceive LLMs.

3.1.2 Uncommon Text-Encoded Structure. The datasets used for training LLMs can be categorized into six types: Wikipedia, books, journals, Reddit links, Common Crawl, and other datasets[34]. These datasets are mostly composed of common natural language, and their content organization generally following conventional grammar or writing habits. However, LLMs also encounter some unusual texts. Although these texts are composed of characters, they exhibit logical relationships or organizational forms different from typical natural language texts.

To describe these special texts, we introduce the concept of "Uncommon Text-Encoded Structure (UTES)." Specifically, UTES refers to text organizational structures that appear less frequently in standard datasets within the fields of natural language processing and data science. Due to its inherent complexity and multi-level structure, UTES is difficult to understand and process directly. They usually require specific parsing techniques or specialized data extraction algorithms to be effectively handled.

UTES include complex data organizations such as tree representations in strings, LaTeX code, flowcharts in character form, JSON, etc. These structures appear in the form of text or strings. Research have shown that LLMs have certain limitations when dealing with such complex structures, such as being prone to errors [10, 33]. Additionally, preliminary experiments have shown that embedding harmful intentions within UTES can generate effective jailbreak prompts.


Based on the observation and analysis of a large number of UTES samples, we found that UTES that can be used as jailbreak templates, exhibit certain patterns in both structure and semantics. According to this discovery, we have selected 12 typical UTES templates as the focus of our current research. And other structures refer to programming languages and data exchange formats not covered by the previous classifications in this paper. We selected three typical UTES for each type. These UTES templates successfully facilitated jailbreaks of ChatGPT in preliminary experiments. It is worth noting that our classification only covers a portion of UTES, and there may be some uncommon structures not mentioned in this paper that could also serve as potential jailbreak templates. Table 1 presents the classification of UTES discussed in this paper.

3.1.3 UTES-based jailbreak attack. The prompt for the UTES-based jailbreak strategy is composed of two main sections: the instruction

Table 1: Classification of UTES

Structure	Description
Tree	A tree structure in a single string using brackets.
Graph	Graph structures through lists of nodes and edges in text form.
Data dictionary	Data fields and their meanings in text using key-value pairs.
Mind map	Demonstrate thought extensions and associations through textual descriptions of nodes and connecting lines.
Flowchart	The steps of a task or process, including decision points, in text form.
Sequence diagram	The sequence of events or interactions between objects in text, including object identifiers and events on a timeline, in text form.
HTML tables	The rows, columns, and cell contents of a table using HTML tags with nested structures.
LaTeX tables	The row and column structure and cell contents using LaTeX’s table environment and commands.
Markdown tables	The row and column structure of a table using simple text symbols and separators.
Python classes	Class properties and methods in text using the class definition syntax of the Python language.
Json	Data in text using key-value pairs and nested object structures.
XML	Hierarchical data structures in text using tag pairs and attributes.

for the fill-in task and a UTES template. We embed harmful behaviors in the description of the template, leaving the ingredients, process, and detail sections of the template blank. We then require the LLMs to recognize the blank parts of the UTES template and fill them according to the description. An example of a UTES template used for jailbreaking LLMs with graph structure is shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2: An example of a jailbreak template**

UTES-based jailbreak attack inducts LLMs to complete two tasks, which are the original prompt with harmful intent and fill-in-the-blank tasks. Existing work [37] has shown that introducing such competing objectives in a prompt is a typical failure mode for LLM defense mechanisms and can lead to an unsecured response. Integrated with UTES, the crafted tail structures that are rarely seen by LLMs during the training, our UTES-based jailbreak attack can effectively circumvent the LLM’s safety alignment. In addition, the UTES is independent from harmful content. Thus, the design of UTES-based jailbreak attack does not require domain-specific expertise, making it accessible to general malicious attackers.

3.2 Combination of different level jailbreak methods

The obfuscation methods at the Character-level, Context-level, and Structure-level exhibit a certain orthogonal relationship. Therefore, we attempt to combine the other two attack methods with

the Structure-level method. This combination not only helps to study the synergistic effects between different levels of obfuscation methods but also improves the stealthiness of the attack. To this end, we combine five Character-level obfuscation methods and one Context-level obfuscation method with the UTES-based jailbreak attacks.

3.2.1 Preliminary combination . We directly apply character-level obfuscation methods to the harmful content in the UTES template to achieve a combination of the two. We constructed five obfuscation methods from the levels of character, word, and sentence. These include: Letter-to-Number Mapping, GB18030 Encoding, Double Reverse Obfuscation, Custom Letter Mapping, Letter Indexed Permutation. We insert two examples of benign text obfuscation before the fill-in task instructions in the jailbreak prompt. Without further explanation, the LLM will learn from these examples and subsequently decode the obfuscated text, i.e., the harmful behavior. Specific implementation details can be found in Appendix A.1.

3.2.2 Comprehensive Combination . Furthermore, we combine the Character-level and Context-level obfuscation methods with the Structure-level. Since the Character-level and Context-level methods are designed as "independent plugins," no additional processing is required. These attack method plugins can be directly combined according to the logical organization of the jailbreak prompts. Specific implementation details can be found in Appendix A.2.

3.3 StructuralSleight

We developed an automated jailbreaking framework called StructuralSleight to comprehensively explore the effectiveness of Structure-level obfuscation methods in jailbreaking attacks. Existing research has explored how LLMs process different categories of structured data [13, 30], which inspired us to classify the 12 UTES templates in StructuralSleight. We divide the UTES templates into four different types: data structures, logical structures, nested table structures, and other structures.

StructuralSleight adopts a 3-stage progressive attack approach, as shown in Figure 3. In this process, to further improve the jailbreak success rate, StructuralSleight uses a greedy strategy to select the best attack method for the next stage.




Figure 3: Overview of StructuralSleight

- (1) First, StructuralSleight performs UTES-based jailbreak attacks on LLMs using these templates. By analyzing the results of SA, StructuralSleight can determine which four UTES templates (from four different categories) achieve the highest attack success rate for each LLM.
- (2) After determining the most effective UTES templates, StructuralSleight proceeds to the Structural and Character/Context Obfuscation Attack (SCA) stage. In this stage, character-level obfuscation methods and context-level obfuscation methods are applied to these four templates to further enhance the effectiveness of the attack.
- (3) Finally, StructuralSleight selects the best-performing methods from the character-level obfuscation attack stage and combines it with the context-level obfuscation method to form the Fully Obfuscated Structural Attack (FSA).

StructuralSleight is designed to be modular, allowing each module to be independently upgraded and replaced. This means that new attack methods can be seamlessly integrated at any time using additional UTES templates or obfuscation methods. Furthermore, once the configuration file is determined, attacks are automatically executed in parallel without human intervention. The automation feature facilitates the execution of large-scale jailbreak attacks. These features help evaluate the security and robustness of LLMs when facing various text structures.

4 EXPERIMENTAL

In this section, we will use StructuralSleight to validate our research questions through a series of experiments. The experiments will focus on discussing the following three aspects: (1) verifying the effectiveness of UTES-based jailbreak attacks through SA; (2) evaluating the enhancement effect brought by the synergy of different levels of obfuscation methods through SCA; (3) studying the impact of a full combination of three levels of obfuscation methods on jailbreaking through FSA.

4.1 Experiment Setup

Model To ensure the broad representativeness and practicality of the experimental results, we conducted experiments using StructuralSleight on six popular LLMs. These included models such as

GPT-3.5-TURBO⁴, GPT-4⁵, GPT-4o⁶, Llama3-70B⁷, Claude2.0⁸, and Claude3-Opus⁹. The selected models span from earlier versions to the latest releases.

Dataset We selected the Harmful Behaviors[43] dataset from AdvBench for the experiments. This dataset contains 520 harmful behavior instructions for the testing of jailbreak attacks and evaluating the safety of LLMs.

Baseline We selected three jailbreak strategies as baseline:

- **PAIR**[7]: A attacker LLM to automatically generate jailbreak prompts for the target LLM.
- **MasterKey**[9]: A finely-tuned LLM to automatically generate jailbreak prompts.
- **CodeAttack**[25]: Jailbreak method that converts malicious requests into code input.

The experiments consist of three main steps: First, StructuralSleight employs 12 UTESs (divided into four types) to conduct SA experiments on six different LLMs. Second, for each LLM, StructuralSleight selects the four templates with the highest attack success rate(ASR) from each of the four UTES categories for SCA experiments. Finally, StructuralSleight integrates the most effective character-level obfuscation method and structure-level obfuscation method in order to perform FSA. Notably, we performed only SA experiments on GPT-3.5-TURBO.

System prompt For GPT-3.5-TURBO, GPT-4, GPT-4o, and Llama3-70B, we used "You are a useful conversational assistant." as the system prompt. For Claude2.0 and Claude3-Opus, the system prompt was empty.

4.2 Automatic evaluation based on LLM

We used an LLM for automated evaluation to determine whether a jailbreak attack was successful or not. The judgment of a successful jailbreak was based on the model’s response to specific prompts. We used the ASR as the evaluation metric. A successful jailbreak was considered if the model’s response violates ethical, legal, or safety

⁴<https://openai.com/chatgpt>

⁵<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4/>

⁶<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

⁷<https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>

⁸<https://www.anthropic.com/index/claude-2>

⁹<https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>

guidelines. We used a scoring system for judgment: a rating of 1 indicated completely safe content, a rating of 10 signified direct violations, and a rating of 5 represented content with contextual risks. Responses with a rating of 5 or higher was considered a successful jailbreak. Additionally, if LLM directly identified the harmful intent in a jailbreak attempt and gave a safe alternative or educational content, it should not be considered a successful jailbreak.

There is an intuitive assumption that automating the jailbreak evaluation task by delegating it to LLMs might be feasible, given the powerful capabilities of LLMs. However, the complex structures of UTES pose significant challenges for accurately automating jailbreak evaluations. To mitigate the impact of these challenges, we have conducted accuracy validation experiments for the evaluator. We selected the responses of GPT-4 under FSA (randomly chose UTES templates and character-level methods) as the validation dataset, which included 520 records. One reason we chose this dataset is that these responses exhibit inherent complexity in both content and format. They include not only typical UTES but also multi-task or ambiguous, nonsensical elements, making themselves a challenging evaluation scenario.

Initially, we manually evaluated the results of GPT-4 to establish a ground truth and then compared them with the results from the automated evaluator. We planned to test two LLMs and two prompt scenarios.

Models used in the evaluator:

- The main criteria for selecting an LLM evaluator included low cost and high performance. GPT-3.5-TURBO was demonstrated high efficiency in jailbreak evaluation tasks [39]. And the GPT-3.5-TURBO API’s cost was low, which was particularly important for large-scale experiments.
- With the recent release of GPT-4o by OpenAI, we have a new option that provided powerful capabilities at a relatively low cost.
- We also considered Claude3-haiku, but we found that it suffered from exaggerated safety, rejected red teaming tasks, and could not be used as an evaluator.

Evaluator Prompt Scheme:

- We used the red teaming evaluation prompt based on easy-jailbreak [42], which was the representative generic scheme currently. To mitigate the negative impact of excessively long contexts on evaluation accuracy [19], we modified the structure of the original red teaming evaluation prompt and optimized it using prompt engineering techniques.
- Based on complex structures and our jailbreak methods, we emphasized in the evaluation prompt. The LLM should focus on the components, processes, or details within the response templates. Specifically, we instructed the LLM to extract the additional content generated by the fill-in task before proceeding at first. Then it should evaluate this task.

The experimental results are shown in Table 2. We selected the evaluation scheme with the highest ASR (87.5%), i.e., the multi-step evaluation prompt based on GPT-4o. Compared to directly harmful content, evaluating harmful content embedded in UTES was more challenging. This also further verifies the vulnerability of LLMs in the UTES perspective. The main reason why the ASR of general

Table 2: Evaluator test of our prompt with Red-team’s prompt on GPT-3.5-TURBO and GPT-4o

	GPT-3.5-TURBO		GPT-4o	
	Number	Accuracy	Number	Accuracy
Red Teaming Prompt	340	65.38%	408	78.46%
Our Prompt	414	79.62%	455	87.50%

evaluation prompt in the UTES environment was low was that the description content in the jailbreak prompt would mislead the LLM evaluator. For example, if the description content was harmful but the LLM did not actually fill in the harmful content, the evaluator might perceive it as harmful.

We recommended adjusting the details of the evaluation prompt according to the jailbreak method when performing automated jailbreak assessment tasks. For the responses generated by LLMs, they should be preprocessed to remove text that related to harmful intent from the original input, or only extract details from the responses. This process aims to reduce the impact of complex formats or descriptions of harmful intent on the evaluator.

4.3 Results

Table 3 shows the highest ASR of StructuralSleight and existing jailbreak methods on LLMs in the Harmful Behaviors dataset. StructuralSleight achieves high ASR on LLMs in a single jailbreaking attempt, which directly shows that UTES-based jailbreak attacks have significant effectiveness. This result suggests that existing mainstream LLMs have shortcomings in safety alignment at the text structure level. It is worth noting that even Claude3-Opus, which is well known for its security, and the latest releases Llama3-70B and GPT-4o, still have certain security risks.

The security of newly released LLMs is generally higher than that of earlier released LLMs. However, the security of GPT-4o has declined compared to GPT-4. The instruction-following and understanding capabilities of GPT-4o have greatly improved compared to OpenAI’s previous models, exceeding the range that its security capabilities can match. The new features introduced during the iteration process of LLMs may instead bring new security risks.

To comprehensively address the research questions raised in this paper, the following sections will discuss the corresponding experimental results according to the three stages of the attack.

Further comparing StructuralSleight’s three-level progressive attack strategy, we find that SCA achieves the best results on LLMs. This verifies our hypothesis that obfuscation methods at different levels can produce synergistic effects and exhibit a certain degree of orthogonality. Specifically, the ASR of SCA on LLMs is significantly higher than that of SA, which only uses UTES-based jailbreak, demonstrating the advantages of combining obfuscation methods at different levels. However, counter-intuitively, FSA does not further improve the performance of jailbreak attacks as we anticipated. Although FSA achieves the same ASR as SCA on GPT-4 and GPT-4o, its performance on other LLMs is inferior to SCA. This suggests that excessive obfuscation may be counterproductive.

4.3.1 Results of SA. In the SA experiments, StructuralSleight generate 6,240 jailbreak prompts from 12 different UTES templates and

Table 3: ASR of baseline attacks and our StructuralSleight on the AdvBench dataset. SA: Structural Attack; SCA: Structural and character/context-obfuscation attack. FSA: fully obfuscated structural attack.

Method	Trials	Attack Success Rate(↑)					
		GPT3.5-TURBO	GPT-4	Claude2.0	Claude3-Opus	Llama3-70B	GPT-4o
MASTERKEY	5	46.69%	18.26%	-	-	-	-
PAIR	3	42.00%	54.00%	4.00%	-	-	-
CodeAttack	1	94.00%	80.00%	84.00%	-	-	-
StructuralSleight-SA	1	90.38%	37.69%	17.50%	1.73%	29.42%	37.69%
StructuralSleight-SCA	1	-	60.00%	96.00%	82.31%	92.00%	94.62%
StructuralSleight-FSA	1	-	54.00%	17.88%	20.38%	45.96%	91.00%

fed them into each target model. In this way, we generated a total of 37,440 queries to evaluate the security and robustness of LLMs in the face of UTES-based attacks. The results of the SA experiment are shown in Table 4. Notably, we only conducted SA experiments on GPT-3.5.

SA showed significant effectiveness on GPT-3.5-TURBO, with an average ASR of 67.12% and a maximum ASR of 90.38%. This implies that the existing LLM safety alignment techniques, which primarily focus on natural language, do not demonstrate effective generalization when confronted with structured environments. However, SA produced almost no effective jailbreak response on Claude3-Opus. Overall, the ASR of jailbreak methods that directly embed harmful behavior within UTES is low. The reason is that harmful behaviors are directly exposed in the input, making them easily detected and rejected. StructuralSleight’s SCA solves this problem.

We find that existing LLMs have different security weaknesses in terms of text structure, which may be due to differing alignment methods or focuses during security adjustments. For each LLM, we selected the template with the highest ASR within each UTES category for SCA. Taking GPT-4o as an example, StructuralSleight selected: Graph (37.69%), Python classes (23.08%), Mind map (22.12%), and LaTeX tables (6.54%).

The type of UTES has an impact on the ASR of jailbreak. Attacks based on data structures have relatively high ASR on most LLMs, especially on GPT-3.5-TURBO and GPT-4o. This shows that inputs formatted as data structures may be more likely to trigger security vulnerabilities in the model. In contrast, attacks based on nested table structures generally have lower ASR. This is most likely because this data type is prevalent in UTES and LLM security experts have performed safety alignment on this data. Despite weaker performance on LLMs with strong security, logical structures can still be used as a jailbreak vector. In addition, embedding harmful content within a code environment has been proven effective, which is consistent with Ren et al.’s findings [25].

Finding 1: Using SA alone shows a certain level of effectiveness on GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4o. However, using SA alone is easily rejected by LLMs with strong security measures since the harmful content is directly exposed.

4.3.2 Results of SCA. Table 5 presents the experimental results of StructuralSleight in the SCA phase. LLMs generated jailbreak

methods that achieved the highest ASR in SCA: GPT-4 (60%), GPT-4o (94.62%), LLaMA3-70B (92%), Claude 2.0 (96%), and Claude 3-opus (82.31%).

The experimental results prove that different levels of obfuscation methods are complementary and can produce synergistic effects. Figure 4 presents a comparison of the average ASR of four UTES templates in SA and SCA. It can be observed that the selected UTES templates in the SCA scenario show a significant improvement in ASR compared to SA. This indicates that the combination of structural-level obfuscation with character/contextual obfuscation can further enhance attack performance, achieving deception from dual perspectives.


However, for a given obfuscation method, different LLMs show significant differences in ASR, reflecting their unique defects in safety alignment. Specifically, Llama3-70B, Claude2.0, and GPT-4o are highly sensitive to GB18030 encoding. GPT-4 is vulnerable to Letter-to-Number Mapping and Double Reverse Obfuscation. Claude3-Opus has weaker defenses against Custom Letter Mapping, Letter-to-Number Mapping, and Letter Indexed Permutation. In contrast, although different LLMs can exhibit vulnerabilities in specific obfuscation methods, they can achieve successful defenses against other obfuscation methods. Therefore, in order to achieve the most effective results, when designing SCA attacks, it is necessary to consider the characteristics of the target LLM and select character-level obfuscation methods that match them. It should be noted that these obfuscation methods failed to successfully implement attacks in preliminary experiments when they existed independently.

On the other hand, we evaluated the effectiveness of Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation as a context-level obfuscation method. The experimental results show that this method achieves high ASR on Llama3-70B, GPT-4, and GPT-4o, but most of the requests are rejected on Claude2.0 and Claude3-Opus. We believe the reason is that the multi-task approach does not hide harmful content, while the Claude models are highly sensitive to such content. Once sensitive words are detected, the LLM will decisively terminate the response, even if the LLM has already initiated some task responses. This reflects the stronger content safety defenses of Claude models.

It is worth noting that, under SCA, different models of LLMs from the same manufacturer reveal different weaknesses. This indicates that there is still some optimization space in the safety alignment

Table 4: The results of the SA experiment

SA	GPT-3.5-TURBO	GPT-4	GPT-4o	Claude2.0	Claude3-Opus	Llama3-70B	Avg
dictionary data	63.27%	0.19%	30.19%	14.04%	1.35%	4.04%	17.58%
Graph data	90.38%	4.62%	37.69%	13.85%	0.96%	5.19%	24.89%
binary tree	84.62%	0.77%	28.85%	12.31%	0.00%	5.96%	23.32%
class in python	87.31%	28.08%	23.08%	17.50%	1.73%	29.42%	29.81%
json	59.62%	0.77%	5.38%	1.35%	0.00%	1.73%	11.21%
XML	21.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%	0.96%	3.24%
flowchart data	69.04%	0.58%	14.04%	7.88%	0.19%	0.58%	13.63%
mind map data	62.31%	0.96%	22.12%	9.42%	0.19%	0.77%	14.48%
timeline	81.54%	0.38%	10.38%	5.38%	0.00%	2.12%	14.95%
html data	49.81%	2.50%	3.27%	2.31%	0.00%	1.92%	8.98%
latex data	67.50%	3.46%	6.54%	1.35%	0.19%	3.65%	12.64%
markdown data	68.65%	1.92%	5.00%	3.46%	0.00%	1.15%	13.24%
Avg	67.12%	3.69%	15.54%	7.44%	0.38%	4.79%	15.66%

**Figure 4: The ASR comparison of four UTES templates in SA and confusion attacks**

of LLMs. The new features introduced in the iterative development of LLMs may bring new security vulnerabilities.

Finding 2: Structure-level obfuscation can work synergistically with character/context-level obfuscation, and combining them can enhance the effectiveness of jailbreak attacks.

4.3.3 Results of FSA. The experimental results of the FSA are shown in Table 6. FSA shows a certain effectiveness. Specifically, the ASR of GPT-4o and GPT4 reached 91% and 54% respectively. The ASR of FSA is higher than the Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation strategy in SCA across all 5 LLMs.

However, comparing Table 5 with Table 6, it can be found that the overall performance of FSA does not exceed the ASR of SCA. In most LLMs, the ASR of FSA has declined. Excessive combinations of obfuscation can be described as prompts containing complex instructions. Following complex instructions is a challenging task for LLMs [12] and may have a counterproductive effect on jailbreak attacks.

Furthermore, other context-level obfuscation methods can be proposed to expand the StructuralSleight method library and combined with effective character-level obfuscation methods to generate more powerful jailbreak attacks.

Finding 3: FSA demonstrates a certain level of effectiveness, but excessively combining multiple levels of obfuscation methods may adversely affect the outcome of jailbreak attacks.

4.4 How does the jailbreak attack in StructuralSleight work?

The experimental results show that when utilizing UTES templates and obfuscating malicious intentions, LLMs are more susceptible to jailbreak attacks. We conducted a detailed analysis of the reasons behind successful attacks and discovered that the most effective

Table 5: The results of the SCA experiment

SA	SCA	Llama3-70B	Claude2.0	GPT4	Claude3-Opus	GPT-4o	
Data Structures	character level	Custom letter Mapping	0.19%	15.00%	12.88%	73.27%	4.81%
		GB18030 encoding	92.31%	95.58%	25.38%	1.54%	94.62%
		Letter-to-Number Mapping	0.19%	0.77%	60.19%	73.46%	56.15%
	structural-level	Double Reverse Obfuscation	37.31%	0.00%	53.46%	3.46%	80.77%
		Letter Indexed Permutation	1.15%	82.31%	12.50%	34.42%	27.69%
		Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation	24.42%	0.58%	17.31%	3.65%	94.23%
		Avg	25.93%	32.37%	30.29%	31.63%	59.71%
Other Structures	character level	Custom letter Mapping	3.08%	10.00%	15.58%	38.27%	7.50%
		GB18030 encoding	55.19%	87.12%	43.08%	0.38%	87.12%
		Letter-to-Number Mapping	0.38%	3.85%	34.23%	46.92%	52.12%
	structural-level	Double Reverse Obfuscation	66.35%	0.00%	47.12%	44.23%	53.08%
		Letter Indexed Permutation	2.88%	69.62%	20.00%	42.31%	32.69%
		Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation	32.31%	0.19%	36.92%	0.77%	85.19%
		Avg	26.70%	28.46%	32.82%	28.81%	52.95%
Logical Structures	character level	Custom letter Mapping	0.19%	20.19%	3.27%	73.46%	4.04%
		GB18030 encoding	86.35%	89.23%	16.15%	1.35%	81.54%
		Letter-to-Number Mapping	0.58%	15.00%	57.12%	50.96%	80.19%
	structural-level	Double Reverse Obfuscation	22.50%	4.81%	53.08%	7.12%	81.35%
		Letter Indexed Permutation	2.69%	80.77%	2.50%	57.31%	59.81%
		Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation	43.85%	7.50%	32.31%	3.65%	86.54%
		Avg	26.03%	36.25%	27.40%	32.31%	65.58%
Nested Table Structures	character level	Custom letter Mapping	4.04%	13.08%	5.00%	65.19%	4.81%
		GB18030 encoding	89.23%	78.27%	17.31%	0.19%	83.85%
		Letter-to-Number Mapping	0.00%	10.77%	20.58%	82.31%	81.92%
	structural-level	Double Reverse Obfuscation	39.42%	0.00%	48.85%	13.85%	85.19%
		Letter Indexed Permutation	2.12%	82.88%	10.38%	56.92%	53.65%
		Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation	24.42%	3.08%	16.73%	3.27%	85.00%
		Avg	26.54%	31.35%	19.81%	36.96%	65.74%
Avg	26.30%	32.11%	27.58%	32.43%	60.99%		

Table 6: The results of the FSA experiment

SA	FSA		Model	ASR
	SCA-Character level	SCA-Structure level		
Data dictionary	Custom letter Mapping	Muti-task	GPT-4	54%
Tree	GB18030 encoding	Muti-task	Llama3-70B	45.96%
Graph	GB18030 encoding	Muti-task	GPT-4o	91%
Graph	GB18030 encoding	Muti-task	claude2.0	17.88%
LaTex tables	Custom letter Mapping	Muti-task	claude3-Opus	20.38%

attack methods can be attributed to three key factors: fill-in task instructions, uncommon text structure templates, and hiding methods for harmful request text.

StructuralSleight combines two approaches: competing objectives and mismatched generalization [37]. User instructions often conflict with the security objectives of LLMs, leading to a form of competition between goals. At the same time, due to the rarity of UTES templates, existing safety alignment strategies struggle to generalize well to text containing UTES.

Although security strategies may contain mechanisms such as online filtering and guardrails [24], by hiding the harmful text,

UTES can still induce LLMs to generate unsafe content. This suggests that current LLMs have weaknesses in comprehending complex text structures.

Obfuscation methods reduce the readability of harmful content in UTES, increasing the difficulty for LLMs to understand and reject malicious requests, forming a "synergistic effect" with the UTES template. Consequently, in the pursuit of LLM safety alignment, the alignment of complex structures should be an indispensable component.

5 RELATED WORKS

5.1 Safety Alignment for LLMs

Safety alignment techniques aim to ensure the model’s behavior aligns with human intentions, thereby refusing to generate unsafe outputs. Currently, the main safety alignment methods can be categorized into two major types: instruction tuning and Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF)[25].

Instruction tuning is achieved by fine-tuning models on public datasets and evaluating them on a different set of tasks. This approach relies on high-quality instruction data and the efficacy of pre-trained models[22, 38]. In this domain, researchers have made

significant progress, optimizing multiple aspects of instruction tuning, including data, instructions, and experimental comparisons[3, 11, 28, 35].

RLHF optimizes model behavior through human feedback to improve its safety and controllability[4]. However, RLHF faces challenges in reward design, environmental interaction, and agent training, which complicate the development of robustly aligned AI systems[16, 29]. To address these challenges, researchers have proposed improvements such as safe training [8], PPO-max[41], and self-alignment[18, 32].

In addition, Constitutional AI are gaining attention as an emerging safety alignment strategy. It trains LLMs through a self-improvement mechanism that replaces human feedback with a set of rules or principles to guide LLMs to output harmless results. This approach ensures a system that generates beneficial, honest, and harmless results by setting behavioral norms and using reinforcement learning mechanisms to guide model outputs. It does so replacing human feedback with feedback generated from principle sets.

Our research indicates that StructuralSleight can serve as an effective testing tool to assess security vulnerabilities, when LLMs are exposed to uncommon structures and complex inputs.

5.2 Jailbreak Attacks on LLMs

Jailbreak attacks are inputs that can trigger LLMs to generate unsafe content. Attackers craft prompts that bypass LLM defense mechanisms, causing them to violate usage policies and to generate responses that produce harmful content[9]. While safety alignment of LLMs can mitigate such issues, jailbreak attacks can still make LLMs vulnerable to undesirable behaviors[40]. We roughly divide the existing work into two categories: character-level obfuscation and context-level obfuscation.

Character-level obfuscation hides malicious intent by processing harmful content at the character, word, and sentence levels. At the character level, techniques such as Base64 queries [37] and leetspeak (replacing letters with visually similar numbers and symbols) are used to encode sentences and conceal harmful intent. At the word level, methods include Pig Latin or splitting sensitive words into substrings through payload division [15]. At the sentence level, this includes translating into other languages or simply asking the model to obfuscate in a way it can understand [2].

Context-level obfuscation focuses on adding extra contextual information to harmful behaviors. This additional information can mislead LLMs' judgments on harmful behaviors or guide LLMs to unintentionally generate harmful content. By incorporating carefully designed extra information into prompts or conversations, malicious attackers can bypass LLMs' safety alignment mechanisms. This causes LLMs to produce harmful content or perform tasks that should not be executed. Examples include prefix injection [17, 23], refusal suppression [37], role-playing [21, 27, 36], objective hijacking [9,10], multi-tasking [31], and more.

Our work innovatively starts from the perspective of the input text structure and systematically evaluates how LLMs can safely handle inputs based on unusual structures or complex formats. This provides insights into the generalization effect of current LLM security mechanisms in new domains. This research guides the

development of more secure LLMs and more effective protective measures.

6 CONCLUSION

This study comprehensively reveals that text structure can serve as a potential carrier for jailbreak attacks. It proposes a class of jailbreak attack strategies based on Uncommon Text Encoding Structure (UTES) to address the inadequacy of LLM security alignment from the perspective of text structure. This research comprehensively reveals that text structure can be used as a potential vehicle for jailbreak attacks and proposes a class of jailbreak attack strategies based on UTES. This discovery provides a new perspective for subsequent research. Based on this strategy, we developed StructuralSleight, a scalable automated jailbreak framework, which implements three attack methods: Structural Attack, Structural and Character/Context Obfuscation Attack, and Fully Obfuscated Structural Attack. During this process, StructuralSleight uses a greedy strategy to select the best one for the next stage to reduce the complexity. In addition, we identified the challenge of using LLMs for jailbreak evaluation and provided suggestions for automated evaluation. The experimental results show that StructuralSleight achieves high jailbreak success rates on existing mainstream LLMs, demonstrating the effectiveness of StructuralSleight.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This paper proposes a class of structure-level jailbreak attack methods and develops an automatic jailbreak framework based on them, which could potentially be exploited to induce LLMs to generate harmful content. However, our intention in exposing these vulnerabilities is to promote ethical discussions, drive improvements in defense mechanisms, and contribute to protecting LLMs from such attacks by identifying weaknesses and providing directions for targeted defenses. It is crucial to emphasize the fundamental difference in motivation and impact between responsibly disclosing and exploiting vulnerabilities. We firmly believe that responsibly disclosing these research findings will help researchers and LLM vendors take timely action to address the deficiencies and maintain the operational security of LLMs.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2022. Dan is my new friend. https://www.reddit.com/r/ChatGPT/comments/zlcyr9/dan_is_my_new_friend/.
- [2] 2023. You can use GPT-4 to create prompt injections against GPT-4. <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/BNCDeXejSZpkuu3yz/you-can-use-gpt-4-to-create-prompt-injections-against-gpt-4>.
- [3] Vamsi Aribandi, Yi Tay, Tal Schuster, Jinfeng Rao, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, San- ket Vaibhav Mehta, Honglei Zhuang, Vinh Q Tran, Dara Bahri, Jianmo Ni, et al. 2021. Ext5: Towards extreme multi-task scaling for transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.10952* (2021).
- [4] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862* (2022).
- [5] Yoshua Bengio, Geoffrey Hinton, Andrew Yao, Dawn Song, Pieter Abbeel, Trevor Darrell, Yuval Noah Harari, Ya-Qin Zhang, Lan Xue, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, et al. 2024. Managing extreme AI risks amid rapid progress. *Science* (2024), eadn0117.
- [6] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15, 3 (2024), 1–45.
- [7] Patrick Chao, Alexander Robey, Edgar Dobriban, Hamed Hassani, George J. Pappas, and Eric Wong. 2023. Jailbreaking Black Box Large Language Models in

- Twenty Queries. arXiv:2310.08419 [cs.LG]
- [8] Josef Dai, Xuehai Pan, Ruiyang Sun, Jiaming Ji, Xinbo Xu, Mickel Liu, Yizhou Wang, and Yaodong Yang. 2023. Safe rlhf: Safe reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12773* (2023).
 - [9] Gelei Deng, Yi Liu, Yuekang Li, Kailong Wang, Ying Zhang, Zefeng Li, Haoyu Wang, Tianwei Zhang, and Yang Liu. 2024. MASTERKEY: Automated jailbreaking of large language model chatbots. In *Proc. ISOC NDSS*.
 - [10] Jiayan Guo, Lun Du, Hengyu Liu, Mengyu Zhou, Xinyi He, and Shi Han. 2023. GPT4Graph: Can Large Language Models Understand Graph Structured Data? An Empirical Evaluation and Benchmarking. arXiv:2305.15066 [cs.AI]
 - [11] Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. 2021. Towards a unified view of parameter-efficient transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04366* (2021).
 - [12] Qianyu He, Jie Zeng, Qianxi He, Jiaqing Liang, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. From Complex to Simple: Enhancing Multi-Constraint Complex Instruction Following Ability of Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15846* (2024).
 - [13] Jin Huang, Xingjian Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, and Jiaqi Ma. 2023. Can llms effectively leverage graph structural information: when and why. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16595* (2023).
 - [14] Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. Challenges and applications of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10169* (2023).
 - [15] Daniel Kang, Xuechen Li, Ion Stoica, Carlos Guestrin, Matei Zaharia, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Exploiting programmatic behavior of llms: Dual-use through standard security attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05733* (2023).
 - [16] Tomasz Korbak, Kejian Shi, Angelica Chen, Rasika Vinayak Bhalerao, Christopher Buckley, Jason Phang, Samuel R Bowman, and Ethan Perez. 2023. Pretraining language models with human preferences. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 17506–17533.
 - [17] Patrick Levi and Christoph P Neumann. 2024. Vocabulary Attack to Hijack Large Language Model Applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02637* (2024).
 - [18] Xian Li, Ping Yu, Chunting Zhou, Timo Schick, Luke Zettlemoyer, Omer Levy, Jason Weston, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Self-alignment with instruction backtranslation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06259* (2023).
 - [19] Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 12 (2024), 157–173.
 - [20] Yi Liu, Gelei Deng, Zhengzi Xu, Yuekang Li, Yaowen Zheng, Ying Zhang, Lida Zhao, Tianwei Zhang, Kailong Wang, and Yang Liu. 2023. Jailbreaking chatgpt via prompt engineering: An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13860* (2023).
 - [21] Keming Lu, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. Large Language Models are Superpositions of All Characters: Attaining Arbitrary Role-play via Self-Alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12474* (2024).
 - [22] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
 - [23] Yao Qiang, Xiangyu Zhou, and Dongxiao Zhu. 2023. Hijacking large language models via adversarial in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09948* (2023).
 - [24] Traian Rebedea, Razvan Dinu, Makesh Sreedhar, Christopher Parisien, and Jonathan Cohen. 2023. Nemo guardrails: A toolkit for controllable and safe llm applications with programmable rails. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10501* (2023).
 - [25] Qibing Ren, Chang Gao, Jing Shao, Junchi Yan, Xin Tan, Wai Lam, and Lizhuang Ma. 2024. Exploring Safety Generalization Challenges of Large Language Models via Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07865* (2024).
 - [26] Omar Shaikh, Hongxin Zhang, William Held, Michael Bernstein, and Diyi Yang. 2023. On Second Thought, Let’s Not Think Step by Step! Bias and Toxicity in Zero-Shot Reasoning. arXiv:2212.08061 [cs.CL]
 - [27] Yunfan Shao, Linyang Li, Junqi Dai, and Xipeng Qiu. 2023. Character-llm: A trainable agent for role-playing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10158* (2023).
 - [28] Irene Solaiman and Christy Dennison. 2021. Process for adapting language models to society (palms) with values-targeted datasets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 5861–5873.
 - [29] Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. 2020. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 3008–3021.
 - [30] Yuan Sui, Mengyu Zhou, Mingjie Zhou, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2024. Table meets llm: Can large language models understand structured table data? a benchmark and empirical study. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 645–654.
 - [31] Lichao Sun, Yue Huang, Haoran Wang, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Yuan Li, Chujie Gao, Yixin Huang, Wenhan Lyu, Yixuan Zhang, Xiner Li, Zhengliang Liu, Yixin Liu, Yijue Wang, Zhikun Zhang, Bertie Vidgen, Bhavya Kailkhura, Caiming Xiong, Chaowei Xiao, Chunyuan Li, Eric Xing, Furong Huang, Hao Liu, Heng Ji, Hongyi Wang, Huan Zhang, Huaxiu Yao, Manolis Kellis, Marinka Zitnik, Meng Jiang, Mohit Bansal, James Zou, Jian Pei, Jian Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Jiawei Han, Jieyu Zhao, Jiliang Tang, Jindong Wang, Joaquin Vanschoren, John Mitchell, Kai Shu, Kaidi Xu, Kai-Wei Chang, Lifang He, Lifu Huang, Michael Backes, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, Philip S. Yu, Pin-Yu Chen, Quanquan Gu, Ran Xu, Rex Ying, Shuiwang Ji, Suman Jana, Tianlong Chen, Tianming Liu, Tianyi Zhou, William Wang, Xiang Li, Xiangliang Zhang, Xiao Wang, Xing Xie, Xun Chen, Xuyu Wang, Yan Liu, Yanfang Ye, Yinzi Cao, Yong Chen, and Yue Zhao. 2024. TrustLLM: Trustworthiness in Large Language Models. arXiv:2401.05561 [cs.CL]
 - [32] Zhiqing Sun, Yikang Shen, Qinlong Zhou, Hongxin Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, David Cox, Yiming Yang, and Chuang Gan. 2024. Principle-driven self-alignment of language models from scratch with minimal human supervision. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
 - [33] Xiangru Tang, Yiming Zong, Jason Phang, Yilun Zhao, Wangchunshu Zhou, Arman Cohan, and Mark Gerstein. 2024. Struc-Bench: Are Large Language Models Really Good at Generating Complex Structured Data? arXiv:2309.08963 [cs.CL]
 - [34] A Thompson. 2022. What’s in my AI? *Life Architect*. <https://lifearchitect.ai/whats-in-my-ai> (2022).
 - [35] Angelina Wang and Olga Russakovsky. 2023. Overwriting pretrained bias with finetuning data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 3957–3968.
 - [36] Zekun Moore Wang, Zhongyuan Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhao Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Man Zhang, et al. 2023. Rolellm: Benchmarking, eliciting, and enhancing role-playing abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00746* (2023).
 - [37] Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2024. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
 - [38] Wei Wei, Chao Huang, Lianghao Xia, Yong Xu, Jiashu Zhao, and Dawei Yin. 2022. Contrastive meta learning with behavior multiplicity for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 1120–1128.
 - [39] Jiahao Yu, Xingwei Lin, and Xinyu Xing. 2023. Gptfuzzer: Red teaming large language models with auto-generated jailbreak prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10253* (2023).
 - [40] Youliang Yuan, Wenxiang Jiao, Wenxuan Wang, Jen-tse Huang, Pinjia He, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023. Gpt-4 is too smart to be safe: Stealthy chat with llms via cipher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06463* (2023).
 - [41] Rui Zheng, Shihan Dou, Songyang Gao, Yuan Hua, Wei Shen, Binghai Wang, Yan Liu, Senjie Jin, Qin Liu, Yuhao Zhou, et al. 2023. Secrets of rlhf in large language models part i: Ppo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04964* (2023).
 - [42] Weikang Zhou, Xiao Wang, Limao Xiong, Han Xia, Yingshuang Gu, Mingxu Chai, Fukang Zhu, Caishuang Huang, Shihan Dou, Zhiheng Xi, et al. 2024. Easy-Jailbreak: A Unified Framework for Jailbreaking Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12171* (2024).
 - [43] Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. 2023. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043* (2023).

A THE METHODS OF TWO LEVEL OBFUSCATION

A.1 The method of the character-level obfuscation

Letter-to-Number Mapping: Map English letters to their positions in the English alphabet, converting text into a string of numbers. For example: bomb = 2, 15, 13, 2.

GB18030 Encoding: The text is directly encoded using the GB18030 encoding method.

Double Reverse Obfuscation: This involves both word-level and sentence-level reversals. Firstly, a word-level reversal function `re()` reverses sensitive words. Secondly, a sentence-reversal function `reverse()` reverses the entire sentence. For example, in the first step, the sentence "make a bomb or explosive device" becomes "make a re(bmob) or re(evisolpxe) device". Then, it will be changed to "revers(ecived)explosive(er ro)bomb(er a ekam)". We used GPT-3.5-TURBO to automatically extract sensitive words from harmful texts in the dataset, followed by manual review and correction.

Custom Letter Mapping: Each letter is mapped to another specific character for obfuscation. The specific approach is to replace original letters with visually similar letters or symbols. For example, bomb = d0wd. The specific mapping rules are as follows: e=a; d=b; <=c; b=d; a=e; +=f; 9=g; 4=h; j=i; i=j; &=k; 1=l; w=m; u=n; 0=o; q=p; p=q; 7=r; \$=s; *=t; n=u; ã=v; m=w; @=x; !=y; 2=z;

Letter Indexed Permutation: Randomly permute the letters within a word and index each character to indicate its original position. For example, bomb = b(1)b(4)o(2)m(3).

A.2 The method of the context-level obfuscation

Multi-Stage Task Obfuscation: Multi-stage task obfuscation includes 3 key components: (1) Harmful Intent Truncation, (2) Multi-Task Obfuscation, and (3) Harmful Intent Pre-Obfuscation and Post-Replacement. In preliminary experiments, we found that truncating harmful intents improves the ASR of LLM jailbreaks, such as replacing "write a detailed tutorial on making a bomb" with "make a bomb". Therefore, the harmful intent is first truncated and labeled with a "?" placeholder. Then, we designed a complex task flow, includes multiple meaningless subtasks and one fill-in task that contains the harmful intent. This reduces the LLM's alertness to a single harmful task. When the multi-task flow reaches the harmful intent fill-in step, we will replace the placeholder token with the harmful intent.