

Appendix

A L_2 optimization

For L_2 the quadratic programming problem defined in equation (1) of the main text is given by

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \|\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \leq r \quad \wedge \quad \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} = c \quad \wedge \quad u \leq \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta} \leq \ell. \quad (1)$$

where $[u, \ell]$ is the valid interval for pixel values, r is the trust region and \mathbf{b} denotes the normal vector of the decision boundary.

Without box-constraints the optimization problem is straight-forward to solve, see algorithm 1. First, we move towards the boundary, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\delta} = c\mathbf{b} / \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2$, such that $\mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} = c$ is fulfilled. We then move in a direction most aligned with $\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ but orthogonal to \mathbf{b} until either (a) $\|\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2$ is minimized or (b) the trust region bound is reached $\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 = r$.

Algorithm 1: L_2 optimization without box-constraints.

Data: clean image \mathbf{x} , perturbed image $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, boundary \mathbf{b} , logit-difference c , trust region r

Result: optimal perturbation $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ minimizing (1) without box-constraint

begin

$\boldsymbol{\delta} \leftarrow c\mathbf{b} / \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2$ // move towards boundary

if $\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 > r$ **then**

 optimization problem is infeasible

else

$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp \leftarrow (\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) - \mathbf{b} \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})^\top \mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{b}}$ // descent direction along boundary

$\boldsymbol{\delta} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\delta} + \epsilon \boldsymbol{\Delta}_\perp$ // descent until $\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 = r$ or $\|\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2$ is minimized

end

end

To include box-constraints we follow an approach similar to active set methods: we first solve (1) without box-constraints using algorithm 1 and then clip each δ_k to a valid solution, i.e. $\delta_k \leftarrow \text{clip}_{[u, \ell]}(x_k + \delta_k) - x_k$ where $\text{clip}_{[u, \ell]}(\cdot)$ maps values to the closest point in the valid region (i.e. either u or ℓ). Notice that the clipping cannot increase the distance to \mathbf{x} or the size of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ but might move $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta}$ away from the boundary. We hence iterate this procedure several times until convergence (which is guaranteed because $\mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} - c$ contracts towards zero in every step), see algorithm 2. Since (1) is a convex problem the solution is guaranteed to be the global minimum. In practice the algorithm converges within a handful of iterations even on ImageNet. We successfully validated the results of the algorithm against off-the-shelf optimizers.

B L_∞ optimization

For L_∞ the quadratic programming problem defined in equation (1) of the main text is given by

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \|\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \boldsymbol{\delta}\|_\infty \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \leq r \quad \wedge \quad \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} = c \quad \wedge \quad u \leq \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta} \leq \ell. \quad (2)$$

where $[u, \ell]$ is the valid interval for pixel values, r is the trust region and \mathbf{b} denotes the normal vector of the decision boundary. Eq. (2) can be rewritten with a slack variable ϵ ,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}, \epsilon} \epsilon \quad \text{s.t.} \quad -\epsilon \leq \mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \boldsymbol{\delta} \leq \epsilon \quad \wedge \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \leq r \quad \wedge \quad \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} = c \quad \wedge \quad u \leq \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta} \leq \ell. \quad (3)$$

Algorithm 2: L2 optimization.

Data: clean image \mathbf{x} , perturbed image $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, boundary \mathbf{b} , logit-difference c , box-constraints $[\ell, u]$, trust region r

Result: optimal perturbation $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ minimizing (1)

begin

$c_0 \leftarrow c$

$r_0 \leftarrow r$

$\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$

$k \leftarrow 0$

while $k < \text{maximum number of steps}$ **do**

$\Delta\boldsymbol{\delta}_k \leftarrow \text{L2_without_box_constraints}(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_k, \mathbf{b}, c_k, r_k)$

$\boldsymbol{\delta}_{k+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\delta}_k + \Delta\boldsymbol{\delta}_k$

$\boldsymbol{\delta}_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{clip}_{[\ell, u]}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \boldsymbol{\delta}_{k+1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$

$c_k \leftarrow c - \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{k+1}$

$r_k \leftarrow r - \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_{k+1}\|$

$k \leftarrow k + 1$

end

end

We note that the element-wise inequality constraints can be fused: for each element we have two valid intervals, $\delta_k \in [\ell - \tilde{x}_k, u - \tilde{x}_k]$ and $\delta_k \in [x_k - \tilde{x}_k - \epsilon, x_k - \tilde{x}_k + \epsilon]$. The intersection of the two intervals, which we denote as $[\tilde{\ell}_k^\epsilon, \tilde{u}_k^\epsilon]$, is the valid region of δ_k . We can hence simplify (3) as

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}, \epsilon} \quad \epsilon \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{\ell}_k^\epsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\delta} \leq \tilde{u}_k^\epsilon \quad \wedge \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \leq r \quad \wedge \quad \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} = c. \quad (4)$$

For fixed ϵ we can solve 4 for $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ by solving the subproblem,

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \tilde{\ell}_k^\epsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\delta} \leq \tilde{u}_k^\epsilon \quad \wedge \quad \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta} = c \quad \wedge \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_2^2 \leq r. \quad (5)$$

We note that this subproblem is exactly the same problem we encountered before in the L_2 case, algorithm 2. We then perform a binary search over ϵ . Algorithm 3 summarizes the method. We successfully validated the results of the algorithm against off-the-shelf optimizers.

Algorithm 3: L_∞ optimization.

Data: clean image \mathbf{x} , perturbed image $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, boundary \mathbf{b} , logit-difference c , box-constraints $[\ell, u]$, trust region r , initial ϵ , range $[\epsilon_\ell, \epsilon_u]$ for ϵ

Result: optimal perturbation δ minimizing (2)

begin

$\epsilon_0 \leftarrow \epsilon$

$k \leftarrow 0$

while $k < \text{maximum number of steps}$ **do**

$[\tilde{\ell}^\epsilon, \tilde{u}^\epsilon] \leftarrow [\ell - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, u - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}] \cap [x - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \epsilon_k, x - \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \epsilon_k]$

$\delta_k \leftarrow \text{L2_with_box_constraints}(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{b}, c, r = \infty, \tilde{\ell}^\epsilon, \tilde{u}^\epsilon)$ // algorithm 2

if $\|\delta_k\|_2^2 > r$ **then**

$\epsilon_{k+1} \leftarrow (\epsilon_u + \epsilon_k)/2$

$\epsilon_\ell = \epsilon_k$

else

$\epsilon_{k+1} \leftarrow (\epsilon_k + \epsilon_\ell)/2$

$\epsilon_u = \epsilon_k$

$\delta \leftarrow \delta_k$

 // store best solution

end

$k \leftarrow k + 1$

end

end
