

Verifying Properties of Binary Neural Networks Using Sparse Polynomial Optimization

Srećko Đurašinović, Jianting Yang, Jean-Bernard Lasserre, Victor Magron,

Jun Zhao

To cite this version:

Srećko Đurašinović, Jianting Yang, Jean-Bernard Lasserre, Victor Magron, Jun Zhao. Verifying Properties of Binary Neural Networks Using Sparse Polynomial Optimization. R&T Days 2024, Jul 2024, Toulouse (FRANCE), France. 2024. hal-04720757

HAL Id: hal-04720757 <https://laas.hal.science/hal-04720757v1>

Submitted on 4 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Verifying Properties of Binary Neural Networks Using Sparse Polynomial Optimization

Joint work with Jianting Yang¹ , Jean-Bernard Lasserre³ , Victor Magron³ and Jun Zhao 2 ¹CNRS@CREATE, Singapore; ²Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; ³ LAAS-CNRS

Summary

This work explores methods for verifying the properties of Binary Neural Networks (BNNs), focusing on robustness against adversarial attacks. Despite their lower computational and memory needs, BNNs, like their full-precis counterparts, are also sensitive to input perturbations. Established methods for solving this problem are predominantly based on Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) and Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP) techniques, which often face scalability issues. We introduce an alternative approach using Semidefinite Programming (SDP) relaxations derived from sparse Polynomial Optimization (POP). Our approach, compatible with continuous input space, not only mitigates numerical issues associated with floating-point calculations but also enhances verification scalability through the strategic use of tighter first-order semidefinite relaxations. We demonstrate th of our method in verifying robustness against both ∥*.*∥∞ and ∥*.*∥2-based adversarial attacks.

For any $i \in [\![1,L]\!]$, the internal block \mathbf{B}_i implements successively three different operations: affine transfor-
mation, batch normalization and point wise binarization, so that its output vector, denoted by x^i , mation, batch normalization and point-wise binarization, so that its output vector, denoted by \bm{x}^i , belongs to {−1*,* 1} *ni* . These operations are described by a set of trainable parameters:

The output block **B***o* applies a softmax transformation to the affinely-transformed outputs of the last hidden layer, i.e., for each $j \in [1, n_{L+1}],$

Keywords: **Binary Neural Networks, Robustness Verification, Sparse Polynomial Optimization, Semidefinite Programming**

Binary Neural Networks

Let $L \geq 1$ be the number of hidden layers of a classifying BNN, with layer widths being given by \bm{n} = $(n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_L, n_{L+1})$ T $\in \mathbb{N}^{L+2}$, where n_0 and n_{L+1} are input and output dimensions. A feed-forward BNN is a mapping from the input region $\mathcal{R}_{n_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ to the output set $\llbracket 1,n_{L+1} \rrbracket$ realized via successive compositions of several internal blocks $(\mathbf{B}_i)_{i=1,...,L}$ and an output block \mathbf{B}_o :

Consider a sequence of vector-valued functions (\bm{h}_i,\bm{g}_i) $i \in \llbracket 1, L \rrbracket$ such that

 $\sqrt{ }$

LAAS

Research and

Daus

Technology

$$
BNN: \mathcal{R}_{n_0} \to [1, n_{L+1}]
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{x}^0 \mapsto BNN(\boldsymbol{x}^0) := \operatorname{argmax} (\mathbf{B}_o(\mathbf{B}_L(\dots(\mathbf{B}_1(\boldsymbol{x}^0))))).
$$
 (1)

Let us suppose that $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket =: I_0 = \cup$ *p* $\mu_{k=1}^{p} I_k$ with I_k not necessarily disjoint. The subsets I_k , called *cliques*, correspond to the subsets of variables $\bm{x}_{I_k}:=\{x_i,i\in I_k\}.$ An instance of the BNN robustness verification problem of the form (5) exhibits correlative sparsity since

- There exist $(f_k)_{k \in [\![1,p]\!]}$ such that $f = \sum_{k=1}^{p}$ $\frac{p}{k} f_k$, with $f_k \in \mathbb{R}[{\boldsymbol{x}}_{I_k}]$,
- \bullet The polynomials \bm{g} can be split into disjoints sets J_k , such that $\bm{g}_i(\cdot)_j\in J_k$ if and only if $\bm{g}_i(\cdot)_j\in\mathbb{R}[\bm{x}_{I_k}]$. Moreover, $g_B \in J_k$ for $k \in [\![1,p]\!]$. Since $h_i(\cdot)_j$ only depends on x_j^i
induced by inequality constraints that mimic the cassading RNN structure $^{\imath}_{j}$, the overall sparsity structure is induced by inequality constraints that mimic the cascading BNN structure.

$$
\left(\boldsymbol{W}^{[i+1]},\boldsymbol{b}^{[i+1]}\right)_{i\in[0,L]} \in \{-1,0,1\}^{n_{i+1}\times n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{i+1}}, \ \left(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{[i]},\boldsymbol{\beta}^{[i]},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{[i]},\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2,[i]}\right)_{i\in[1,L]} \in (\mathbb{R}^{n_i})^4. \tag{2}
$$

Deriving a Tighter First-Order Relaxation - τ^1_{ti} tighter*,*cs

 \implies For each $i \in [\![1, L]\!]$, we replace the constraint defined in (4b) by the following two constraints:

Table 1: Structure of an internal block **B***i* .

$$
\bm{x}_j^{L+1} = \frac{\exp(z_j)}{\sum_{k=1}^{n_{L+1}} \exp(z_k)}, \text{ where } z_j = \bm{W}_{(j:)}^{[L+1]} \bm{x}^L + \bm{b}_j^{[L+1]}.
$$

Figure 2: (left) Performance comparison for different models and input regions, given by *δ*||*.*||[∞] = 127*.*5*ϵ*. (right) Comparing τ_{LP} and τ_{ti}^1 $t_{{\rm lighter, cs}}$ bounds for ${\rm BNN}_1$ and different $\delta_{||\cdot||_\infty}.$ The relative improvement is up to 55% .

Verification against $\|.\|_2$ **-attacks** ↓

Verification against $\|.\|_{\infty}$ **-attacks** ↓

Figure 1: (left) A toy BNN with $L = 2$ and $(n_0, n_1, n_2, n_3) = (3, 2, 2, 2)$. The cliques I_1, I_2, I_3 (red polygons) and I_4,I_5 (blue polygons) are used to compute $\tau^1_\text{tighter,cs}$ (right). We let $\tilde{\bm{g}}_i = \{\tilde{\bm{g}}_i^1\}$ $\frac{1}{i}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}_i^2$ $\widetilde{g}_i^{\texttt{t}1}$ $\{\tilde{g}^{\mathsf{t} 2}_i\}$.

. (3)

Sparse SDP for BNN Robustness Verification

$$
\boldsymbol{x}^{i}:=\textsf{sign}\left(\boldsymbol{W}^{[i]}\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}+\boldsymbol{b}^{[i]}\right) \implies \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{h}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x}^{i}):=\boldsymbol{x}^{i}\odot\boldsymbol{x}^{i}-1=0,\\ \boldsymbol{g}_{i}(\boldsymbol{x}^{i},\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}):=\boldsymbol{x}^{i}\odot(\boldsymbol{W}^{[i]}\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}+\boldsymbol{b}^{[i]})\geq \boldsymbol{0}, \end{cases} \tag{4a}
$$

Suppose that the input perturbation region $\bm{B} \subseteq$ \mathbb{R}^{n_0} can be encoded via positivity conditions on (at most quadratic) polynomials $\bm{x}^0\mapsto\bm{g_B}(\bm{x}^0)$. Then, the *standard* form BNN verification problems becomes:

$$
\min_{\boldsymbol{x}^0, \boldsymbol{x}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}^L} f(\boldsymbol{x}^0, \boldsymbol{x}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}^L)
$$
 (5a)

$$
\tau := \begin{cases}\n x^0, x^1, \dots, x^L \ f(x^0, x^1, \dots, x^L) & \text{(ba)} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad \boldsymbol{h}_i(x^i) = \boldsymbol{0}, \ i \in [\![1, L]\!], \\
\boldsymbol{g}_i(x^i, x^{i-1}) \geq \boldsymbol{0}, \ i \in [\![1, L]\!], \\
\boldsymbol{g}_B(x^0) \geq \boldsymbol{0}, & \text{(5d)}\n \end{cases}
$$

where f is linear/quadratic, e.g., $f = f_k^{\mathrm{adv}}$ $f_k^{\mathrm{adv}}(\bm{x}^0, \bm{x}^1, \dots, \bm{x}^L) := \langle \bm{W} \rangle$ [*L*+1] $\widetilde{y}^{[L\mp1]}_{\cdot,j}-\bm{W}$ [*L*+1] $\langle \mathcal{L}^{[L+1]}_{(k:,)} , \bm{x}^L \rangle + \bm{b}$ [*L*+1] $\frac{\lfloor L + 1 \rfloor}{\bar{y}} - \bm{b}$ [*L*+1] $k^{\nu+1}$.

Exploiting Sparsity

The hierarchy of correlatively sparse SDP relaxations is then given by

$$
\boxed{\tau_{\text{cs}}^d := \sup_{\lambda,\sigma} \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid f - \lambda - \sum_{k=1}^p \sigma_k \in \mathcal{I}_d(\boldsymbol{h}), \sigma_k \in \mathcal{Q}_d(\{\boldsymbol{g}_i(\cdot)_j \in J_k\})\}}.
$$

$$
\begin{cases}\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}_i^1(\boldsymbol{x}^i, \boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}) := (\boldsymbol{x}^i + 1) \odot (\boldsymbol{W}^{[i]} \boldsymbol{x}^{i-1} + \boldsymbol{b}^{[i]}) \ge 0, \tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}^i, \boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}) := (\boldsymbol{x}^i - 1) \odot (\boldsymbol{W}^{[i]} \boldsymbol{x}^{i-1} + \boldsymbol{b}^{[i]}) \ge 0. \end{cases}
$$
\n(6a)

 \implies Add the following two *redundant* quadratic constraints, i.e., tautologies, to the optimization problem (5):

$$
\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}_i^{\mathsf{t}1}(\boldsymbol{x}^i,\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}) := (\boldsymbol{x}^i + 1) \odot \left(\text{nv}\left(\boldsymbol{W}^{[i]}\right) - \boldsymbol{W}^{[i]}\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}\right) \geq \boldsymbol{0},\right)
$$
\n(7a)

$$
\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}_i^{\mathsf{t}2}(\boldsymbol{x}^i,\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}) := (\boldsymbol{1} - \boldsymbol{x}^i) \odot \left(\text{nv}\left(\boldsymbol{W}^{[i]}\right) + \boldsymbol{W}^{[i]}\boldsymbol{x}^{i-1}\right) \geq \boldsymbol{0},\right)
$$
(7b)

Theorem

For any BNN verification problem, τ^1_{ti} $\tau_{\rm tighter, cs}^1 = \tau_{\rm tighter}^1 \geq \tau^1.$ If $L \geq 2$, there exists an affine f such that the inequality is strict. We also have $\tau_{\text{tighter},\text{cs}}^1 \geq \tau_{\text{LP}}$ for any affine $f.$

Some Numerical Results

τ Soft-MILP $\tau_{\text{tighter,cs}}^{\perp}$ Model $\delta_{||.||_{\infty}}$ cert. $t(s)$ cert. $t(s)$ $t\left(s\right)$ cert. BNN_1 : 4 | 94 1.21 6.69 $[784, 500, 500, 10$ 15150 251.90 10.76 0.03 21 1.00 $w_s = 34.34\%$ 0.06 38.32 20112 428.24 1.50 BNN_2 : 14 0.03 | 59 11.97 $\rm 0.25$ $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array}$ 2.23 0.05 23 42.37 9 63 0.50 $\left[784,500,500,10\right]$ 220.53 $\bf{0}$ 0.08 9 139.18 10 | 19 455.61 $w_s = 19.07\%$ $0.75\,$ $\mathbf{0}$

Figure 3: (left, center) Performance comparison for different BNN models and input regions, given by *δ*||*.*||² = 255*ϵ*. (right) Verification against ∥*.*∥2-attacks: illustrating the significant speedup for specific instances.

References

1. Jianting Yang, Srećko Đurašinović, Jean-Bernard Lasserre, Victor Magron and Jun Zhao. *Verifying Properties of Binary Neural Networks Using Sparse Polynomial Optimization*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17049, 2024.

2. Victor Magron and Jie Wang. Sparse Polynomial Optimization: Theory and Practice. World Scientific, 2023.

3. Victor Magron and Jie Wang. TSSOS: a Julia library to exploit sparsity for large-scale polynomial optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00915, 2021.

Laboratoire d'analyse et d'architecture des systèmes du CNRS

Laboratoire conventionné avec

