

# HAD-GAN: A Human-perception Auxiliary Defense GAN model to Defend Adversarial Examples

Wanting Yu   Hongyi Yu\*   Lingyun Jiang   Mengli Zhang  
Kai Qiao   Linyuan Wang   Bin Yan

Information Engineering University, Zhengzhou 450001, China

ywan1107@163.com, xxgmaxyu@163.com, yunlord@outlook.com, zml1122y@163.com, qiaokai1992@gmail.com

## Abstract

*Adversarial examples reveal the vulnerability and unexplained nature of neural networks. It is of great practical significance to study the defense of adversarial examples. In fact, most adversarial examples that misclassify networks are often undetectable by humans. In this paper, we propose a defense model to train the classifier into a human-perception classification model with shape preference. The proposed model consisting of a TTN (Texture Transfer Network) and an auxiliary defense GAN (Generative Adversarial Networks) is called HAD-GAN (Human-perception Auxiliary Defense GAN). The TTN is used to extend the texture samples of a clean image and makes classifiers more focused on its shape. And GAN is utilized to form a training framework for the model and generate the images we need. A series of experiments conducted on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR10 show that the proposed model outperforms the state-of-the-art defense methods for network robust, and have a significant improvement on defense ability of adversarial examples.*

## 1. Introduction

Deep learning (DL) [1] has advanced in various tasks of artificial intelligence, including image recognition [2], natural language processing [3], and speech processing [4]. These advances were owing to deep neural networks which can represent complex probability distribution over high dimensional data. Despite these advances, deep neural networks remain imperfect. In particular, they show weaknesses with respect to adversarial examples when compared to humans[5]. Adversarial examples can effectively fool a neural network to change its predictions, and the human eye cannot distinguish such examples from the original images. Moreover, Adversarial examples can be transferred across different models [6]. Obviously, improving the robustness of neural networks and find effective defenses against these attacks is important, especially for security-critical applications.

In recent years, many defense methods against adversarial examples have been proposed, and these methods can be divided into two categories. The first category is to enhance the robustness of the network itself. Adversarial training [7-8] and defensive distillation [9] for classifiers are two of the typical and excellent methods. These defense methods often require attack patterns to be known a priori, or better against white- box attacks, but not good for black-box attacks. The second category is a variety of data preprocessing methods. For example, PixelDefend [10], High-Level Representation Guided Denoiser (HGD) [11], ComDefend [12] are designed to combat against adversarial examples. Detection based defense against adversarial examples from the Steganalysis

point of view [13] also shows excellent performance advantages. The latter category of method is easier to implement because they do not require retraining of the neural network. This type of preprocessing method mostly treats adversarial examples defense as a denoising process and does not fully explain the effect of adversarial examples on the network. Research on improving the robustness of the network itself is limited.

Recently, researchers from MIT first proposed through the complete theoretical derivation and experimental verification: Adversarial Examples Are Not Bugs, They Are Features [14]. By extracting and analyzing the robustness and non-robustness of the image, they point out that the neural network does not necessarily identify the image in the way of human decision-making, but may instead capture some pixel information that has no effect on humans. Then, they studied the dataset obtained by robust training and found that the features with robust training are more “human-aligned” [15]. Their research pointed out a new research direction for studying adversarial examples for the first time, and gave a complete theoretical framework. The research results also further confirm our idea. However, the robust and non-robust features in their paper are mainly extracted by pre-trained models. Their experiments did not give a concrete method that could utilize human perception to effectively improve the model robustness against adversarial examples.

At the same time, the samples encountered in human learning are rich and diverse with interference and imagination. One of the most promising methods for unsupervised learning in complex distribution in recent years, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [16], have the same effect as the human imagination. Originally introduced by Goodfellow et al. (2014), the GAN is a novel and successful generation model and deep learning framework. In this paper, GAN's excellent image generation ability is used to improve the pre-training network structure, and an auxiliary defense GAN model close to human experience is designed.

Inspired by human thinking and learning growth, this paper introduces the rich imagination of people and the human eye's preference for shape into the design of the network structure, and provides another “human” intelligence to the neural network. Specifically, the idea for designing a network has the following three aspects:

- When the human eye observes the target, the attention of the target shape is greater than the texture. By observing the confrontation sample, it is possible to confuse the classification network but not to deceive the human eye. The shape characteristics of the original target may maintain the macro shape.
- The existing data used to train the classification network are usually clear and clean (no noise). However, from the perspective of human learning, the information obtained is usually varied and ambiguous. It is also the learning of such rich information that makes the human eye's ability to resist noise stronger.
- Human learning is not only based on existing limited samples, but also from samples generated by samples based on human imagination. This is similar to the training process of GAN. When designing the structure, we also try to control the loss function, so that the training is generated in a specific direction.

Our contributions:

1. We propose HAD-GAN, a novel model that can bring human shape perception preferences into adversarial examples defense by adding a texture transfer module. Our defense mechanism turns the training of the target classifier into a dynamic learning process similar to humans.
2. For the first time, we associate GAN with human imagination. Our model links the last layer

of the target classifier in parallel with a discrimination layer and completes the defense training just during the GAN training process.

3. Currently, many defense methods carried out under conditions known attack method. The proposed model does not need to assume that the attack method is known a priori and is designed to improve the robustness of the network itself.
4. Defense tests were performed on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR10 datasets at different target networks, and attack methods. We experimentally verified our defense model. At the same time, our model achieves better performance than the current defense method(adversarial training, defensive distillation, Defense-GAN and BCGAN).

The rest of the paper is organized as following. We present the necessary related work regarding existing attack and defense methods, GANs, and Shape vs texture Property researches of Neural Networks in Section 2. Our defense model, which we call HAD-GAN, is formally motivated and introduced in Section 3. Then, we describe our experimental settings concretely and present experimental results in Section 4. Finally, the conclusion is given in Section 5.

## 2. Related work

### 2.1 Existing attack and defense methods

#### 2.1.1 Attack methods

Finding a good attack is a bi-criteria optimization problem, in which the attacker tries to minimize the norm of the perturbation while trying to maximize the loss function. Various attack models and algorithms have been used to target classifiers. The current common attack attacks are mainly divided into white-box attacks and black-box attacks. Black-box attack: The attacker has no access to the classification model parameters and is unable to access the training data set of the classification model. White-box attack: The attacker can get all the parameters of the classification model, such as network structure and permissions, details of the defense mechanism.

**Fast Gradient Sign Method (FGSM)** [17] Given an image  $x$  and its corresponding true label  $y$ , the FGSM attack sets the perturbation  $\delta$  to:

$$\delta = \epsilon \cdot \text{sign}(\nabla_x J(x, y)) \quad (1)$$

FGSM (Goodfellow et al., 2015) was designed to be extremely fast rather than optimal. It simply uses the sign of the gradient at every pixel to determine the direction in which to change the corresponding pixel value.

**Projected Gradient Descent attack (PGD)** [18] An iterative attack method proposed by Madry et al. in 2017, and can be regarded as a multi-step variant of FGSM. The goal of the adversary is to solve the following type problem:

$$\arg \max_{\|\delta\|_p \leq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}(F_\theta(x + \delta), y) \quad (2)$$

In practice, the authors propose an iterative method to compute a solution:

$$x^{t+1} = \prod_{x \oplus \delta} (x^t + \alpha \text{sign}(\nabla_x J(x, y))) \quad (3)$$

where  $x \oplus \delta$  is the *Minkowski* sum between  $\{x\}$  and  $\{\|\delta\|_p \leq \epsilon\}$ ,  $\alpha$  is the gradient step size,  $\prod_S$  is the projection operator on  $S$ . Madry et al. showed that (the  $l_\infty$  version of) PGD is equivalent to Basic Iterative Method (BIM), another important iterative attack. As for Fast Gradient Methods,

PGD can be implemented either with  $p = \infty$  or  $p = 2$ . In this paper, we use PGD to represent a variety of iterative attacks.

**Carlini&Wagner attack (CW)** [19] To craft an  $l_2$ -norm adversarial example, Carlini & Wagner (2017) solves the following type optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\eta\|_2 + c \cdot f(x + \eta) \\ \text{s.t. } x + \eta \in [0,1]^n \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Where  $f$  is the objective function that is defined to drive the example  $x$  to be misclassified.  $c$  represents a suitably chosen constant. CW attack is an  $l_2$  attack since the objective function aims to minimize the  $l_2$  norm of the perturbation. CW can also be implemented as a  $l_\infty$  attack but this attack is not as effective as classical  $l_\infty$  attacks.

### 2.1.2 Defense methods

At the same time, various defense mechanisms have been employed to combat the threat from adversarial attacks. As discussed in Section 1, defense mechanisms can be divided in two categories: Enhancing the robustness of the network and data preprocessing.

**Enhancing the robustness of the network** Adversarial training is a popular approach to defense against adversarial attack by adding the adversarial examples generated using one or more chosen attack models to training set [17,20]. This often results in increased robustness when the attack model used to generate the augmented training set is the same as that used by the attacker. Since the defense mechanism designed to protect against one type of attack often offers poor performance against the other, some improvement methods have also been gradually proposed such as Randomized Adversarial Training [21]. These defense methods show that data quality and training process both affect model quality, and data enhancement can improve the model's ability to defend attacks. Defensive distillation [22] is another typical method. Defensive distillation trains the classifier in two rounds using a variant of the distillation method. The approach reduces the model's sensitivity to input variations by decreasing the absolute value of model's Jacobian matrix and makes it difficult for attackers generate adversarial examples. However, it was shown that it fails to adequately protect against black-box attacks transferred from other networks.

**Data preprocessing** The second category are a variety of data preprocessing methods. PixelDefend [10], proposed by Song et al., can convert an image with interference into a clear image before inputting it to the classifier. Similarly, some researchers have perceived perceptual disturbances as noise and designed High-Level Representation Guided Denoiser (HGD) to eliminate these noise [11]. Xiaojun Jia et al. proposed ComDefend, an end-to-end image compression model to combat against adversarial examples [12]. At the same time, detection based defense against adversarial examples from the Steganalysis point of view [13] also shows excellent performance advantages. In contrast to the first category, this category of method is easier to implement because they do not require retraining of the neural network. Although these methods have good performance, they mostly treat adversarial examples defense as a denoising process and may not fully explain the effect of adversarial examples on the network. The reason why is difficult to defend adversarial examples because it is difficult to build a theoretical model of the adversarial examples generation process.

## 2.2 Generative adversarial networks(GANs)

Generative Adversarial Network (GANs) [16], Originally introduced by Goodfellow et al. (2014), is one of the most promising methods for unsupervised learning in complex distribution in

recent years. GANs are a class of artificial intelligence algorithms implemented by a system of two neural networks contesting with each other in a zero-sum game framework. GANs have achieved impressive results in image generation [23], image editing [24], and representation learning [25,26]. The quality and diversity of results from GANs have continued to improve, from generating simple digits and faces, to synthesizing natural scene images, to generating 1k photorealistic portraits, to producing one thousand object classes. Some modified versions of GAN also demonstrate performance advantages in many scenarios. Such as, Condition-GAN [27], WGAN [28], Cycle-GAN [29] and SAGAN [30]. The key to GANs' success is the idea of an adversarial loss that forces the generated images to be, in principle, indistinguishable from real photos. This loss is particularly powerful for image generation tasks, as this is exactly the objective that much of computer graphics aims to optimize.

At present, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) are also used in adversarial examples generation [31] and defense. For defense, Defense-GAN [32] trained a GAN as a denoiser to project samples onto the data manifold before classifier them. But Athalye et al. [33] found that these methods including other input transformations suffered from obfuscated gradient problem and can be circumvented by corresponding attacks. Boundary Conditional GAN [34] is proposed to enhance the robustness of DNN against adversarial examples by generating boundary samples of a pretrained classifier. These methods all take advantage of GAN. The experiments in this paper are also compared with the two methods.

### **2.3 "Texture-Shape" perception of CNN**

In general, convolutional neural networks are thought to identify objects by learning increasingly complex shape representations. Some recent studies seem to illustrate that image textures show a more important role in CNN. Robert et al.[35] quantified two contradictory hypotheses by evaluating CNN and human observers using images with "texture-shape" conflicts. Their tests show that the most important factor in the standard process of artificial intelligence for object recognition is not the shape but the texture. Then, the authors used the style transfer method to generate a new data set, so that the shape of the object is the only useful information left. If the deep neural network wants to use the new training data set to learn to classify objects, it needs to learn the shape. Research also suggests that CNN may tend to be more priority to identify images by shape if learning different textures of the same shape.

Recent research by the MIT team points out that Many applications of machine learning require models that are "human-aligned", i.e., that make decisions based on human-meaningful information about the input [14]. They then reconvered robust training as a tool for enforcing human priors on the features learned by deep neural networks. The resulting robust feature representations turn out to be significantly more aligned with human perception [15]. However, the current research on the difference between neural network and human perception still stays at the level of network characteristics. There is currently no research linking the separate "texture-shape" perception between networks and humans to the emergence of adversarial examples. Whether this perception affects the defense against adversarial examples has not been studied.

## **3. HAD-GAN model**

We propose a new defense network architecture which we called Human-perception Auxiliary Defense GAN (HAD-GAN). In this section, we will elaborate HAD-GAN and introduce the

procedure how to use our HAD-GAN to enhance the robustness of our pre-trained classifier against adversarial examples.

### 3.1 Motivation

Based on the above background and thinking, our model is mainly designed around the following three points:

- **Robust artificial intelligence.** The machine learning system is easily deceived by the change of input information. With the deployment of more intelligence-based systems, it is of practical significance to solve the confrontation problem. Focus on defense against adversarial examples, we design new defense models aiming to improve the robustness of the classification neural network.
- **Make the learning process of network more like humans.** The samples encountered in human learning are diverse and ambiguous, including samples with various disturbances, even combined with imagination. Some studies have found that network classification preferences can be adjusted through control input. Therefore, our defense model is designed based on human thinking and discriminant laws. By more attention to human perception, the model tries to simulate the learning process of people.
- **Take full advantage of GAN.** GAN is a new and successful deep model of generating models. It is worth noting that GAN is similar to human beings in generating images through imagination. Therefore, while considering human perception preferences, we use GAN's excellent image generation capabilities to design an auxiliary defense GAN model that is more in line with human experience.

### 3.2 Network architecture

As described in the picture, our network structure is mainly composed of three sub-networks, including two mappings (**G**: Generator, **TTN**: Texture Transfer Network) and the Discriminator (**D**, contains the target Classifier **C**). The input to our network is the clean image in the dataset. Every generated sample has a corresponding class label  $c$  in addition to the noise  $z$ . **G** uses both to generate images:  $(c, z) \rightarrow X_{fake}$ . **TTN** uses the input image  $x$  and the texture dataset to generate real images for **D**:  $(x, t_1, t_2, \mathbf{L}, t_N) \rightarrow (s_0, s_1, s_2, \mathbf{L}, s_N) \rightarrow X_{real}$ . Then the output images of these two mappings  $X_{fake}$  and  $X_{real}$  are entered into a CNN convolutional neural network containing the target classifier **C**:  $X \rightarrow (c_1, c_2, \mathbf{L}, c_n)$ .

It is worth noting that we connected a fully connected discriminant network in parallel at the penultimate level of the target classifier, so that the target classifier and the discriminant layer together form an adversarial discriminator **D** in GAN, where **D** aims to give both a probability distribution over sources and a probability distribution over the class labels. The training mechanism is also inspired by the ACGAN [36] that discriminator gives both a probability distribution over sources and a probability distribution over the class labels. In this framework, we only need to modify some parameters according to the image characteristics, and we can achieve defense training for almost any classifier.




Figure 1. Model structure of HAD-GAN

### 3.3 Formulation

In this section, we present a set of definitions and main loss functions which allow us to formally describe our framework, theoretical model and algorithm. We develop our framework with these loss functions that enable our network to learn weight parameters of  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  given training samples  $\{x_i\}$ . And the Classifier get more robust through the train on extending texture images. This section is mainly to formulate each module and elements to facilitate the establishment of the latter model. The input to our model is the real image  $X_{\text{real}}$  and its label  $\{c\}$  in the database.

#### 3.3.1 Texture Transfer model

Our texture transfer network(TTN) takes a original image  $x$  and a series selected texture images as inputs, and synthesizes output images corresponding to the textures that recombines the shape of the former and imitates the texture latter.

From the input batch  $x \in \mathbf{R}^{N \times C \times H \times W}$ , we strip every single  $x$  of its original texture and replace it with the style texture of a randomly selected painting through adaptive instance normalization (AdaIN) style transfer [37] with a texture coefficient of  $\alpha$ . We obtain the style images from Kaggle's Painter by Numbers data set because of its large style variety and size.

AdaIN is a simple extension to instance normalization (IN), which we call adaptive instance normalization. AdaIN receives a content input  $x$  and a style input  $y$ , and simply aligns the channel wise mean and variance of  $x$  to match those of  $y$ . Unlike batch normalization (BN), IN or conditional instance normalization (CIN), AdaIN has no learnable affine parameters. Instead, it adaptively computes the affine parameters from the style input:

$$\text{AdaIN}(x, y) = \sigma(y) \left( \frac{x - \mu(x)}{\sigma(x)} \right) + \mu(y) \quad (5)$$

in which we simply scale the normalized content input with  $\sigma(y)$ , and shift it with  $\mu(y)$ . Similar to IN, these statistics are computed across spatial locations.  $\sigma(x)$  and  $\mu(x)$  are computed across spatial dimensions independently for each channel and each sample. Figure 2 shows an overview of our Texture Transfer Network based on the proposed AdaIN layer.




Figure 2. Model structure of TTN

**TTN** use the first few layers of a fixed VGG-19 network to encode the content and style images. An AdaIN layer is used to perform style transfer in the feature space. A decoder is learned to invert the AdaIN output to the image spaces.

$$T(x, s) = g(t) \quad (6)$$

Feature maps

$$t = \text{AdaIN}(f(x), f(s)) \quad (7)$$

decoder  $g$  is trained to map  $t$  back to the image space. Generating the  $T(x, s)$

$$T(x, s, \alpha) = g\left((1 - \alpha)f(x) + \alpha \text{AdaIN}(f(x), f(s))\right) \quad (8)$$

$$t_{ij} = T(x_i, s_j, \alpha) = g\left((1 - \alpha)f(x_i) + \alpha \text{AdaIN}(f(x_i), f(s_j))\right) \quad (9)$$

We use the AdaIN output  $t$  as the content target, instead of the commonly used feature responses of the content image.  $\alpha$  is texture weight parameter, the weight that controls the degree of texture. Since AdaIN layer only transfers the mean and standard deviation of the style features, style loss only matches these statistics.

### 3.3.2 Adversarial Loss

We apply adversarial losses to mapping function  $\mathbf{G}$  and its discriminator  $\mathbf{D}$ . Since they form the GAN structure, we can refer to the loss function of GAN.

$$\min_G \max_D V(D, G) = E_{x \sim p_{data}} [\log D(x)] + E_{z \sim p_z(z)} [\log(1 - D(G(z)))] \quad (10)$$

In order to train the target classification network in  $\mathbf{D}$  at the same time, we facilitate the adversarial losses of ACGAN to improve our adversarial loss. The function becomes the following form with the class labels in addition to the model.

$$X_{\text{fake}} = G(c, z), D(x) = \{P(S | x), P(C | x)\} \quad (11)$$

$$\min_G \max_D V(D, G) = E_{x \sim p_{data}} [\log D(x)] + E_{z \sim p_z(z), c \sim p(c)} [\log(1 - D(G(c, z)))] \quad (12)$$

The objective function is converted into two parts: the log-likelihood of the correct source,  $L_S$ , and the log-likelihood of the correct class,  $L_C$ .

$$L_S = E[\log P(S = \text{real} | X_{\text{real}})] + E[\log P(S = \text{fake} | X_{\text{fake}})] \quad (13)$$

$$L_C = E[\log P(C = c | X_{\text{real}})] + E[\log P(C = c | X_{\text{fake}})] \quad (14)$$

Then  $\mathbf{D}$  is trained to maximize  $L_S + L_C$  while  $\mathbf{G}$  is trained to maximize  $L_C - L_S$ . As the



ACGAN learns a representation for noise  $z$  that is independent of class label [36]. The original generator  $\mathbf{G}$  loss and discriminator  $\mathbf{D}$  loss is as follows,

$$L_{\mathbf{G}} = L_C - L_S \quad (15)$$

$$L_{\mathbf{D}} = L_S + L_C \quad (16)$$

It is highly intuitive that the predictive distribution by the classifier for the samples near the decision boundary is close to a uniform distribution due to the ambiguity which class the boundary samples belong to. Therefore, generating samples closer to the boundary has proven to be a possible way to improve the robustness of the classification model [34]. An additional called CL (Confident Loss) [38] is leveraged to our model loss to improve the performance.

$$L_{CL} = \beta \mathbb{E}_{P(x)} \left[ KL(U(y) \| P_{\theta}(y|x)) \right] \quad (17)$$

where  $\theta$  are parameters of the original classifier, which are fixed during the training of the model.  $U$  is the uniform distribution and  $\beta > 0$  is a penalty parameter.  $KL$  stands for KL divergence. Then the full generator  $\mathbf{G}$  loss is,

$$L_{\mathbf{G}(CL)} = L_C - L_S + L_{CL} \quad (18)$$

Finally, our full objective can be written as:

$$\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{D} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{G}} \max_{\mathbf{D}} L_{\text{GAN}}(\mathbf{G}(c, z), \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{C}, d) | T(x, s)) \quad (19)$$

### 3.3.3 Algorithm Flow

---

#### Algorithm 1 HAD-GAN.

---

**Input:** dataset  $D$ , training epochs  $K$ , batch size  $m$ , texture number  $T$ , texture coefficient  $\alpha$ , noise coefficient  $n$

**for**  $k = 1$  **to**  $K$  **do**

**for** random batch  $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^m \sim D$  **do**

**add noise**(the mean of the gaussian noise is 0 and the variance of the gaussian noise is  $z$ ):

$$x'_i = x_i + n, i = 1, \dots, m$$

**for**  $j = 1$  **to**  $T$  **do**

$$T(x'_i, s_j, \alpha) \leftarrow \text{decoder} \left( (1 - \alpha) f(x'_i) + \alpha \text{AdaIN}(f(x'_i), f(s_j)) \right)$$

**end for**

**get the discriminator: D**  $\leftarrow \{\mathbf{C}, d\}$

**generative adversarial training** (updating model parameters of  $\mathbf{G}$  &  $\mathbf{D}$ ):

$$\theta_{\mathbf{G}}, \theta_{\mathbf{D}}, \theta_{\mathbf{C}} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{G}} \max_{\mathbf{D}} L_{\text{GAN}}(\mathbf{G}(c, z), \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{C}, d) | T(x, s))$$

**Output:** model parameter  $\theta_{\mathbf{G}}, \theta_{\mathbf{C}}$

---

### 3.4 Defense Mechanism

The defense network we designed does not assume a known attack method, but simply leverages the generative power of GAN. The robust classification network can be trained on either a pre-trained classification network or a complete training of the untrained classifier. In order to ensure the defense efficiency, the texture transfer network in our defense model is built on a pre-trained network. After this processing, the main adjustment parameters in **TTN** are input noise

power and texture weight, which effectively improve the training efficiency of the entire defense network. It is worth pointing out that selecting the appropriate texture database according to different classification problems can achieve better experimental results.

We now describe our defense mechanism as follows, and corresponding flow chart of the process is shown in Figure 3.

1. Add the target classifier to our defense models according to the network architecture. Get the well-trained TTN and the texture dataset.
2. Set appropriate noise and texture weight. The noise in our model is set to Gaussian noise.
3. Training HAD-GAN with the losses in Equ.(19) to make the GAN network generator's generation result and the auxiliary classifier's classification correct rate basically stable.
4. Finally, the defensive-trained target classifier is taken out to calculate the robustness of the classifier against various adversarial example.




Figure 3. Defense mechanism

## 4. Experiments

We carried out experiments on the proposed model mainly on the MNIST, Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR10 datasets. In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed HAD-GAN, we quantitatively evaluate the network robustness on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR10 and compare that with other defensive methods. The experiment aims to prove that combining human discriminating preferences will improve the robustness of the network defense against the sample, and explain the similarities and differences between the neural network and the human eye discriminating mechanism. Our method also successfully improve the accuracy of classification under attack conditions.

### 4.1 Experimental settings

We firstly selected the target Classifier based on the dataset complexity. LeNet5 is assumed to be the target Classifier that attacks attempt to fool and our model attempt to defend for MNIST and Fashion-MNIST. For CIFAR10, we leverage ResNet18 instead. As a model based on GAN, the generator is also an important part. We choose a basic generation network with four convolutional blocks layer for MNIST and Fashion-MNIST. As for CIFAR10, U-Net model[1] is leveraged directly. It's obvious that untargeted attack is easier to succeed, results in smaller perturbations, and transfers better to different models. So we use untargeted adversarial examples to see the performance of our model.

We test our defense model against untargeted attacks by FGSM, PGD and CW. We perform FGSM with different magnitude  $\epsilon$  and PGD attack for 40 iterations with the gradient step size  $\lambda=0.01$  on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST, 8 iterations on CIFAR10. Next, we perform  $l_2$ -norm

attack with 2000 test samples. The accuracy of the original classifier and defense-trained classifier by HAD-GAN is computed to show the effectiveness.

#### 4.2 Selection of hyper parameters

We construct our model initially by transferring the main focus of the neural network from the target texture to the shape in natural images. Therefore, our model can not achieve very good performance on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST at the beginning because images in monochrome cannot perform texture conversion effectively. To solve the problem, we add Gaussian noise on input images, which make it easier to generate texture. We also find that images with small sizes cannot provide enough pixels to construct efficient textures. So we adjusted the structure of the **TTN** model by adding two *Resize* modules. The small images are first enlarged to fit the texture image and then restored at the output end. For CIFAR10, adding noise is no longer a necessary operation because the real image itself is already easy to implement texture transformation. The adjusted **TTN** structure shown in Figure 4 makes the experimental results obvious on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR10. The enlarged detail texture images are shown in Figure 5.




Figure 4. Improved TTN model structure

According to the above analysis, it is easy to know that the HAD-GAN must have better performance on nature images with bigger sizes such as ImageNet. But correspondingly, a more advanced generator model of GAN is needed to generate more realistic natural images. This may be beyond the scope of this study, and the relevant results of datasets such as ImageNet will be presented in the future research.

In addition, the texture libraries corresponding to different types of datasets are also different. For example, the images in MNIST and Fashion-MNIST are monochrome and the shapes are displayed by white parts. We empirically found that the two can share a grayscale texture library. For CIFAR-10, a separate color texture library is required. Experiments show that, after the texture library is properly selected, adjusting the texture weight of **TTN** can make **D** achieve better results. In summary, there are two hyper parameters in the neural networks that need to be determined by experiments. The first one is the standard normal distribution gaussian noise parameter  $n$ , and the second one is the texture weight parameter  $\alpha$ . In order to improve the performance of the proposed method, the value of  $n$  and  $\alpha$  is depending on the performance of image auxiliary classification. Specifically, image compression discards part of the image information even if it retains the main structural information of the image. These two hyper parameters are very important to improve the model effect. Therefore, we firstly adjust these two parameters. For more details, the main basis are:

1. Calculate the infinite norm between the texture image and the original image, ie.  $\|x_0 - t_i\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ .
2. Compared with the standard training classifier, the classifier trained by the HAD-GAN model has a classification accuracy on clean samples of no less than 95%.

3. Observe the changes of Gloss and Dloss, and the training process of HAD-GAN tends to converge.

The parameter adjustment basis seems complicated, but the experiment proves that satisfying any two of these three points can achieve ideal experimental results. In subsequent experiments, the corresponding parameters values for each dataset are shown in the following table:


Table 1

Dataset	parameter	Value
MNIST	$n$	0.01
	$\alpha$	0.3
	$\epsilon$	0~0.3
Fashion-MNIST	$n$	0.01
	$\alpha$	0.2
	$\epsilon$	0~0.2
CIFAR10	$n$	0
	$\alpha$	0.03
	$\epsilon$	0~0.05


Particularly,  $\epsilon$  is the perturbation magnitude of the attack method for each dataset. Some enlarged textured images generated by TTN on these three datasets are shown in Figure 5. More textured images and images generated by G are shown in **Appendices**.



(a) textured images for MNIST



(b) textured images for Fashion-MNIST



(c) textured images for CIFAR10

Figure 5. Enlarged textured images generated by TTN

Note that for attack methods, such as FGSM, perturbation magnitude is set up to 0.3, rather 0.4 or bigger, because we find when the attack is too strong (when  $\epsilon > 0.4$ ), the noises are obviously perceptible to human eyes. Thus, the adversarial examples can be even hard to classification by human beings, and this part of the defensive experiment is not the focus of our research.

## 4.3 Result

### 4.3.1 Defensive performance testing

As mentioned above, our model is mainly divided into three sub-networks: **TTN**, **G**, and **D**. In order to verify the defense effect and analyze the performance of our model, we consider designing a comparison experiment that compares the defensive performance of a module with and without it. For example, a round of experiments is performed without **TTN**, and then a set of comparative experiments is performed after the addition of **TTN**. The comparative tests of **TTN** are designed to verify our idea that adding human shape perception can enhance neural network defense performance against adversarial examples. Similarly, we investigate the effect of our defense model by compute the average accuracy of the partly-trained and fully-trained classifier with our model which are tested on adversarial examples produced by different attack magnitude  $\epsilon$  of FGSM and PGD.

Figure 6 respectively shows the experiment results on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, and CIFAR10. The dotted lines(ND: No Defense) show the accuracy of image classification models tested on the adversarial images with no defense. ND is used as a baseline for defensive performance testing. CL is a Loss function added to the GAN to observe the performance improvement after improving the Loss function. The red lines indicate the results without CL. It can be seen that the robustness of the model is significantly improved, only after adding the **TTN** (corresponding to human discrimination preference) to the training model. However, similar to the human eyes, the accuracy rate still decrease in the case of excessive attack perturbation, which also reflects the correlation between network design and human characteristics. In order to slow down the rate of accuracy decline, we join CL during the training process of GAN and continue the experiment. As shown by the blue line, optimizing the network parameters such as the Loss function will also have a certain effect on the improvement of the defensive performance. This part of experiment also shows that combining the advantages of the human eye and the network will be a feasible way to generate “1+1>2” and improve network performance.

In this respect, the classifiers fully-trained by our method increase accuracy on the FGSM strongest attack from 16.5% to 90.5%, the PGD strongest attack from 8.5% to 85.5% for MNIST; the FGSM strongest attack from 17.5% to 80.3%, the PGD strongest attack from 1.5% to 77.8% for Fashion-MNIST; the FGSM strongest attack from 29% to 78.6%, the PGD strongest attack from 5.2% to 76.5% for CIFAR10.




Figure 6. Average accuracy of our defense-trained classifiers tested on FGSM and PGD for different image datasets: (a)MNIST;(b)Fashion-MNIST;(c)CIFAR10

### 4.3.2 Comparisons with other defensive methods

In order to quantitatively measure the performance of our proposed method, we compare the proposed method with other conventional schemes under the same attack distance metric. The results of the comparison on MNIST, Fashion-MNIST and CIFAR10 image dataset are shown in Table 2~4. Compared with these methods, our proposed method achieves performance

improvement. In particular, it achieves nearly 95% accuracy on the FGSM, PGD and CW for MNIST; nearly 85% accuracy on the FGSM, PGD and CW for Fashion-MNIST; nearly 80% accuracy on the FGSM, PGD and CW for CIFAR10. We see that the proposed method achieves the higher defensive accuracy against FGSM, PGD and CW, and the competitive accuracy compared with other defense method such as adversarial training and BCGAN, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed method. Compared with the classifier trained on normal method, the clean images classification accuracy of the classifier trained on our model does not decline a lot. This also shows that our model does not affect the normal classification of clean images by the classifier.

In fact, the core advantage of our method is that we train our network on the clean images rather than adversarial images. In this way, we don't need to use attacking methods to generate adversarial examples, and thus our model is much smaller than many defense method based on adversarial training. Furthermore, our proposed method does not depend on attacking methods and classifiers. And it can be combined with other defensive methods.

Table 2

Defensive method	Clean	FGSM(0.2)	PGD(0.2)	CW
No Defense	99.5	22.3	10.5	24.2
FGSM Adv.Tr(0.2)	99.4	88.9	53.2	65.3
PGD Adv.Tr(0.2)	99.5	87.6	89.6	79.2
Distillation	98.8	93.5	91.6	3.5
Defense-GAN	91.2	75.5	72.0	30.3
BCGAN	97.7	86.3	84.7	78.5
Our Model	97.5	<b>95.0</b>	<b>92.5</b>	<b>89.3</b>

Table 3

Defensive method	Clean	FGSM(0.1)	PGD(0.1)	CW
No Defense	90.5	24.2	5.2	0
FGSM Adv.Tr(0.1)	90.2	79.0	16.5	55.5
PGD Adv.Tr(0.1)	89.5	80.7	81.5	75.6
Distillation	88.5	76.5	75.0	0.0
Defense-GAN	80.2	65.5	43.0	37.5
BCGAN	85.4	72.8	71.5	68.9
Our Model	86.5	<b>83.5</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>80.5</b>

Table 4

Defensive method	Clean	FGSM(0.03)	PGD(0.03)	CW
------------------	-------	------------	-----------	----

No Defense	82.5	35.1	9.7	3.2
FGSM Adv.Tr(0.03)	82.0	58.9	33.2	20.9
PGD Adv.Tr(0.03)	79.8	57.3	30.6	28.4
Distillation	85.8	71.2	70.1	0.0
Defense-GAN	71.2	55.5	42.0	30.3
BCGAN	80.1	67.5	66.5	65.0
<b>Our Model</b>	81.5	<b>80.0</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>75.0</b>

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel defense model to defend adversarial examples. HAD-GAN can be trained on the clean images without known attack methods. For the first time, HAD-GAN combined the shape-texture discrimination preferences of humans and neural networks in the defense against adversarial examples. Experimental results illustrate the effectiveness of our model. More importantly, our work demonstrates that adding human features to the network can improve the robustness of the network against attacks.

Researchers always have to face a choice. Should the model make an "accurate" decision or should it make a "human" decision? The research in this paper further demonstrates that if we want to obtain a method that is both meaningful to humans and faithful to the model, we need to intervene as necessary during the training process. Nowadays, image recognition technology has been widely used in daily life, we need to find a certain balance between these two choices.

## Acknowledgements

## Reference

- [1]. Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton. Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553):436, 2015
- [2]. K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [3]. R. Collobert and J. Weston. A unified architecture for natural language processing: Deep neural networks with multitask learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 160–167. ACM, 2008
- [4]. G. Hinton, L. Deng, D. Yu, G. E. Dahl, A.-r. Mohamed, N. Jaitly, A. Senior, V. Vanhoucke, P. Nguyen, T. N. Sainath, et al. Deep neural networks for acoustic modeling in speech recognition: The shared views of four research groups. *IEEE Signal processing magazine*, 29(6):82–97, 2012.
- [5]. Naveed Akhtar and Ajmal Mian. Threat of adversarial attacks on deep learning in computer vision: A survey. *arXiv:1801.00553*, 2018.
- [6]. Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.



- [7]. Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. International Conference on Learning Representations, Workshop Track, 2014.
- [8]. Alexandre Araujo, Rafael Pinot, Benjamin Negrevergne, et al. Robust Neural Networks using Randomized Adversarial Training[J]. In arXiv: 1903.10219, 2019.
- [9]. Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Xi Wu, Somesh Jha, and Ananthram Swami. Distillation as a defense to adversarial perturbations against deep neural networks. In IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, 2016
- [10]. Yang Song, Taesup Kim, and Sebastian Nowozin. PixelDefend: Leveraging Generative Models to Understand and Defend against Adversarial Examples. In ICLR 2018.
- [11]. Fangzhou Liao, Ming Liang, and Yinpeng Dong. Defense against Adversarial Attacks Using High-Level Representation Guided Denoiser. In CVPR 2018.
- [12]. Xiaojun Jia, Xingxing Wei, and Xiaochun Cao. ComDefend: An Efficient Image Compression Model to Defend Adversarial Examples. In CVPR 2019.
- [13]. Jiayang Liu, Weiming Zhang, Yiwei Zhang et al. Detection based Defense against Adversarial Examples from the Steganalysis Point of View. In CVPR 2019
- [14]. Andrew Ilyas, Shibani Santurkar, Dimitris Tsipras et al. “Adversarial Examples Are Not Bugs, They Are Features”. In arXiv:1905.02175. 2019.
- [15]. Logan Engstrom, Andrew Ilyas, Shibani Santurkar et al. Learning Perceptually-Aligned Representations via Adversarial Robustness. In: ArXiv preprint arXiv: 1906.00945. 2019.
- [16]. Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Advances in neural information processing systems, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [17]. Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. International Conference on Learning Representations, 2015.
- [18]. Aman Sinha, Hongseok Namkoong, and John Duchi. Certifying some distributional robustness with principled adversarial training. 2018.
- [19]. Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In Security and Privacy (SP), 2017 IEEE Symposium on, pages 39–57. IEEE, 2017
- [20]. Seyed-Mohsen Moosavi-Dezfooli, Alhussein Fawzi, and Pascal Frossard. Deepfool: a simple and accurate method to fool deep neural networks. In IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2016.
- [21]. A. Araujo, R. Pinot, B. Negrevergne, et al. Robust Neural Networks using Randomized Adversarial Training. In arXiv: 1903.10219. 2019.
- [22]. Nicolas Papernot, Patrick McDaniel, Xi Wu, Somesh Jha, and Ananthram Swami. Distillation as a defense to adversarial perturbations against deep neural networks. In IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, 2016
- [23]. E. L. Denton, S. Chintala, R. Fergus, et al. Deep generative image models using a laplacian pyramid of adversarial networks. In NIPS, 2015.
- [24]. J. Y. Zhu, P. Krahenbühl, E. Shechtman, and A. A. Efros. Generative visual manipulation on the natural image manifold. In ECCV, 2016.
- [25]. A. Radford, L. Metz, and S. Chintala. Unsupervised representation learning with deep convolutional generative adversarial networks. In ICLR, 2016..
- [26]. T. Salimans, I. Goodfellow, W. Zaremba, V. Cheung, A. Radford, and X. Chen. Improved techniques for training GANs. In NIPS, 2016.

- [27].M. Mirza and S. Osindero. Conditional Generative Adversarial Nets[J]. Computer Science, 2014:2672-2680.
- [28].M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, L. Bottou. Wasserstein GAN[J]. In ICML, 2017.
- [29].J.Y. Zhu, T. Park, P. Isola, et al. Unpaired Image-to-Image Translation using Cycle-Consistent Adversarial Networks[J]. In ICCV, 2017.
- [30].H. Zhang, I. Goodfellow, D. Metaxas, et al. Self-Attention Generative Adversarial Networks[J]. In arXiv: 1805.08318, 2018.
- [31].P. Yu, K. Song, J. Lu. Generating Adversarial Examples With Conditional Generative Adversarial Net[C]// 2018 24th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR). 2018.
- [32].Pouya Samangouei, Maya Kabkab, and Rama Chellappa. Defense-gan: Protecting classifiers against adversarial attacks using generative models. In ICLR 2018
- [33].Anish Athalye, Nicholas Carlini, and David Wagner. Obfuscated gradients give a false sense of security: Circumventing defenses to adversarial examples. In ICML 2018. arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.00420, 2018.
- [34].K. Sun, Z. Zhu, Z. Lin. Enhancing the Robustness of Deep Neural Networks by Boundary Conditional GAN[J]. In arXiv: 1902.11029v1, 2019.
- [35].Robert Geirhos, Patricia Rubisch, and Claudio Michaelis et al. ImageNet-trained CNNs are biased towards texture; increasing shape bias improves accuracy and robustness. In ICLR 2019.
- [36].A. Odena, C. Olah, J. Shlens. Conditional Image Synthesis With Auxiliary Classifier GANs. In ICML, 2017.
- [37].Xun Huang and Serge J Belongie. Arbitrary style transfer in real-time with adaptive instance normalization. In ICCV, pp. 1510–1519, 2017.
- [38].Kimin Lee, Honglak Lee, Kibok Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Training confidence-calibrated classifiers for detecting outof-distribution samples. In arXiv:1711.09325, 2017.

Appendices



(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)




Figure 7: Examples of textured images generated by **TTN** on these three datasets and images generated by **G**. (a) textured images for MNIST. Four consecutive pictures are a group, the first one is the original image, and the last three are the output images corresponding to different texture data. (b) generated images for MNIST. Each column corresponds to a category. (c) textured images for Fashion-MNIST. Three consecutive pictures are a group, the first one is the original image, and the last two are the output images corresponding to different texture data. (d) generated images for Fashion-MNIST. Each column corresponds to a category. (e) textured images for CIFAR10. Four consecutive pictures are a group, the first one is the original image, and the last three are the output images corresponding to different texture data.

There are two interesting phenomena worth pointing out: First, as shown in picture (c), some original figures are difficult to judge categories by human, such as the third set of pictures, the original picture can only see a collar-like area. However, after processing by the TTN network, pixels that are invisible to the human eye on the original image are displayed. After comparison, the texture image categories of these outputs are correct. Second, the generated images are randomly divided into two types: clear background and blurred background. This shows that the network trained by our model can not only process clear images, but also process and classify blurred images with noise interference.