

Decoding Latent Attack Surfaces in LLMs: Prompt Injection via HTML in Web Summarization

Ishaan Verma
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Manipal University Jaipur
Jaipur, India
Ishaan.23fe10cse00546@mujaipur.manipal.edu

Abstract—Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly integrated into web-based systems for content summarization, yet their susceptibility to prompt injection attacks remains a pressing concern. In this study, we explore how non-visible HTML elements such as `<meta>`, `aria-label`, and `alt` attributes can be exploited to embed adversarial instructions without altering the visible content of a webpage. We introduce a novel dataset comprising 280 static web pages, evenly divided between clean and adversarial injected versions, crafted using diverse HTML-based strategies. These pages are processed through a browser automation pipeline to extract both raw HTML and rendered text, closely mimicking real-world LLM deployment scenarios.

We evaluate two state-of-the-art open-source models, Llama 4 Scout (Meta) and Gemma 9B IT (Google), on their ability to summarize this content. Using both lexical (ROUGE-L) and semantic (SBERT cosine similarity) metrics, along with manual annotations, we assess the impact of these covert injections. Our findings reveal that over 29% of injected samples led to noticeable changes in the Llama 4 Scout summaries, while Gemma 9B IT showed a lower, yet non-trivial, success rate of 15%. These results highlight a critical and largely overlooked vulnerability in LLM-driven web pipelines, where hidden adversarial content can subtly manipulate model outputs. Our work offers a reproducible framework and benchmark for evaluating HTML-based prompt injection and underscores the urgent need for robust mitigation strategies in LLM applications involving web content.

Keywords—Large Language Models, Prompt Injection, HTML Attacks, Web Summarization, Adversarial Content, Model Robustness

I. INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) such as Llama, Gemma, and GPT variants have become central to modern web-based applications, offering advanced capabilities in content summarization, conversational assistance, and automated information extraction. Their ability to interpret and distill complex web content has enabled scalable, intelligent interfaces across domains. However, the widespread integration of LLMs into real-world pipelines has also surfaced critical security challenges—most notably, their susceptibility to prompt injection attacks [1][2].

Prompt injection refers to the manipulation of an LLM’s output through carefully crafted inputs designed to subvert its intended behaviour. While early research primarily examined such attacks in plaintext interactions—such as chat interfaces or API calls [1][3]—more recent work has shown that web environments introduce an expanded and less visible attack surface. HTML documents, which form the structural backbone of web content, contain numerous hidden or non-visible elements such as `<meta>` tags, `aria-label` attributes, `alt` text, comments, and invisible `<div>`s. These elements, though not displayed to the user, are often included in the raw text fed to LLMs and can therefore serve as carriers for adversarial prompts [4][5].

Despite their potential risk, HTML-based prompt injection attacks remain relatively underexplored in the machine learning community. Existing studies on LLM security often rely on synthetic examples or fail to simulate the nuances of real web rendering and browser-based content extraction [6]. As a result, current benchmarks do not fully capture how these models behave when exposed to adversarial HTML content within realistic workflows.

In this paper, we aim to fill this gap by presenting a systematic and empirical evaluation of HTML-based prompt injection attacks on LLM summarization pipelines. We construct a dataset of 280 static web pages—each crafted in two variants: a clean version and an injected version containing hidden adversarial instructions encoded via various HTML techniques. These include non-visible script tags, comment blocks, base64-encoded strings, opacity-zero `<div>`s, and metadata elements. By automating the extraction of both raw HTML and rendered visible text using Playwright in a headless browser environment, we approximate real-world web summarization scenarios.

We evaluate the performance and robustness of two state-of-the-art LLMs—Llama 4 Scout (Meta) and Gemma 9B IT (Google)—on summarizing these pages. Our analysis uses both lexical (ROUGE-L) and semantic (SBERT cosine similarity) metrics to measure injection success, and manual annotation to validate adversarial influence. The results show that hidden HTML instructions can reliably manipulate model behavior, with Llama 4 Scout exhibiting a 29.3% injection success rate,

and Gemma 9B IT shows a 15.7% rate, despite no change to visible content.

Here my contributions are threefold:

1. I design and release a reproducible dataset and specifically focused on HTML-based prompt injection.
2. I introduce a comprehensive evaluation framework combining automated metrics with human verification.
3. Then I uncover significant model-specific vulnerabilities and highlight the inadequacy of traditional input sanitization methods for web-integrated LLMs.

These findings call attention to a pressing and often overlooked vulnerability in the LLM ecosystem. As web-based agents and summarization tools increasingly rely on model outputs for downstream tasks, robust defences against invisible prompt injection vectors are urgently needed to ensure safe and reliable deployment of LLM technologies.[15]

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The vulnerability of Large Language Models (LLMs) to prompt injection attacks has emerged as a critical concern as these models are increasingly deployed in real-world web-based systems. While earlier studies primarily explored prompt manipulation in textual or API-driven contexts, the expansion of LLMs into web environments introduces a new dimension of attack—namely, the exploitation of HTML structures and non-visible elements for adversarial control.

A. Prompt Injection in LLMs

Liu et al. present a comprehensive framework for automatic and universal prompt injection attacks capable of undermining even well-aligned LLMs [7]. Their work demonstrates the inherent fragility of LLM behaviour in the presence of carefully constructed adversarial instructions. Similarly, Zhang et al. propose a goal-conditioned injection framework that selectively influences outputs based on task context, revealing how even subtle manipulations can produce semantically divergent responses [8].

The OWASP GenAI Security Project has further formalized the landscape of LLM-specific threats, categorizing prompt injection as a top-priority risk and offering a taxonomy of known attack vectors and preventive practices [9]. These works collectively underscore the importance of designing robust LLM systems that are resilient to both visible and covert adversarial prompts.

B. HTML-Based Adversarial Content

In the domain of web-specific attacks, Tao et al. analyse adversarial HTML manipulations originally developed for phishing detection models [10]. Their findings indicate that hidden HTML elements—such as `<meta>`, `aria-label`, and invisible `<div>` blocks—can effectively bypass traditional sanitization routines while injecting harmful logic into machine learning pipelines. These techniques are particularly concerning in the context of LLMs, where raw HTML is often ingested during summarization or extraction tasks.

More recently, Clusmann et al. conducted a realistic study of prompt injection attacks embedded in HTML structures [11]. By simulating complete web browsing sessions and browser-based rendering pipelines, they showed that LLMs could be reliably manipulated through non-visible content, without altering the user-facing view of the web page. This stealthy nature of HTML-based prompt injection poses a unique challenge for conventional input validation methods.

C. Evaluating Robustness in LLMs

Beyond adversarial input construction, the challenge of evaluating model robustness has also been a topic of ongoing research. Yang et al. conducted a broad survey on LLM robustness and proposed best practices for assessing model performance under adversarial pressure [12]. They argue that traditional metrics like BLEU or ROUGE often fall short in detecting semantic-level distortions. Tools like SBERT-based cosine similarity have thus gained traction for capturing more nuanced shifts in meaning, tone, or factual grounding between clean and manipulated outputs.

However, many existing evaluation pipelines are limited to synthetic datasets or fail to simulate real-world deployment conditions, such as browser-based HTML rendering. As a result, the extent to which LLMs are vulnerable to web-native adversarial prompts remains insufficiently understood.

D. Research Gap and Our Contribution

Despite these advances, there remains a lack of systematic investigation into HTML-based prompt injection, especially in the context of web summarization pipelines. Most prior studies either ignore HTML-specific features or operate in simplified settings that do not capture the complexity of real-world web rendering and user interaction.

In this study, we address this gap by constructing a publicly accessible dataset of HTML pages—half clean and half adversarial injected—using a diverse set of stealthy injection strategies. We evaluate two prominent LLMs, Llama 4 Scout and Gemma 9B IT, across lexical and semantic metrics, and show that even modern, instruction-tuned models remain susceptible to non-visible HTML manipulation.

III. METHODOLOGY

To systematically evaluate the vulnerability of Large Language Models (LLMs) to HTML-based prompt injection attacks, we designed an end-to-end experimental framework that closely mirrors real-world web summarization scenarios. Our methodology encompasses dataset construction, injection strategy design, model evaluation, and reproducibility considerations. [1][2][3][5].

A. Dataset Construction

We curated a dataset consisting of 280 static web pages, drawn from ten real-world web content categories, including blogs, FAQs, news articles, product descriptions, documentation, user reviews, tutorials, and company profiles. Each page was built with realistic HTML and CSS styling to reflect genuine web layout practices. [4][12] For every page, two versions were created:

- A clean version with semantically coherent and neutral content, and
- An injected version, where hidden prompt instructions were embedded using diverse HTML-based strategies [1][4][11].

To ensure consistency, each injected page retained identical visible content as its clean counterpart, differing only in the hidden adversarial elements [4][5].

B. Injection Strategies

We developed eight HTML-based injection techniques to explore a range of covert adversarial vectors. These were selected to represent common yet under-recognized features in web documents that could be exploited to inject prompts undetectable to users:

1. *Hidden <div>*: Embedded adversarial prompts within a <div> styled with `display: none`.
2. *HTML Comments*: Injected prompts within <!--comment --> tags.
3. *Hidden <script> Tags*: Used <script style="display:none"> to house non-executing prompt content.
4. *Base64-Encoded Attributes*: Encoded prompts as Base64 strings stored within custom HTML attributes.
5. *ARIA Labels*: Planted adversarial text within aria-label attributes used by assistive technologies.
6. *Meta Tags*: Injected prompts into <meta name="description"> tags in the <head> section.
7. *Opacity-Zero <div>s*: Housed prompts in elements with `opacity: 0`, making them visually invisible.
8. *Image alt Text*: Added manipulative instructions inside alt attributes of tags.

Each injected page included exactly one randomly selected technique, ensuring broad and unbiased coverage across all categories [4][5].

C. Web Hosting and Extraction Pipeline

To emulate realistic browsing behaviour, all web pages were hosted on GitHub Pages, ensuring proper HTTP delivery, URL structure, and resource rendering. A browser automation framework based on Playwright was used to load each page in headless mode, replicating how a real browser would interpret the DOM [5].

For each page, two content representations were extracted:

- Full HTML source: The raw HTML as served by the browser.
- Rendered visible text: The plain-text content visible to users, obtained using JavaScript DOM traversal scripts [4][11].

This dual-extraction strategy ensured that both machine-readable and human-visible views of the web content were considered during evaluation [5][12].

D. Model Summarization Protocol

We evaluated two state-of-the-art LLMs:

- Llama 4 Scout (Meta), and
- Gemma 9B IT (Google).

For every clean and injected page, both the HTML source and the rendered text were provided as inputs to each model. The models were instructed to generate a concise one-paragraph summary of the webpage using a standardized system prompt. [2][5]. This mirrors real-world scenarios in which LLMs are deployed to summarize web pages directly from crawled or rendered content [2][3][12].

Model outputs were collected for every input variant, resulting in a comprehensive evaluation set comprising over 1,100 summaries.

E. Evaluation Metrics

To quantify the effect of prompt injection, we employed both lexical and semantic metrics:

- *ROUGE-L F1 Score*: Measures the longest common subsequence between clean and injected summaries, offering insight into surface-level divergence.

$$ROUGE - L_{F1} = \frac{(1 + \beta^2) \cdot \left(\frac{LCS(X, Y)}{n}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{LCS(X, Y)}{m}\right)}{\left(\frac{LCS(X, Y)}{n}\right) + \beta^2 \cdot \left(\frac{LCS(X, Y)}{m}\right)}$$

X = reference summary

Y = candidate summary

$LCS(X, Y)$ = length of the Longest Common subsequence between X and Y

m = length of reference summary

n = length of candidate summary

Where β is usually set to 1 to give equal weight to precision and recall. [13][14]

- *SBERT Cosine Similarity*: Assesses semantic deviation using embeddings generated via all-MiniLM-L6-v2 from the Sentence-BERT framework. A lower cosine score indicates a higher semantic shift between summaries.


These metrics were computed pairwise for each clean-injected summary pair across both models.

F. Manual Annotation

In addition to automated metrics, manual inspection was performed to determine whether the injection was successful—i.e., if the model’s summary output was visibly influenced by the injected instruction. Each injected summary was reviewed by annotators for evidence of tone change, content distortion, or explicit instruction leakage (e.g., adopting a pirate persona or changing the summary’s perspective).

Figure 1 explains the end to end experimentation workflow.

Figure 1: Workflow for HTML-Based Prompt Injection Detection in LLMs



IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Model Performance Overview

Two large language models—Llama 4 Scout and Gemma 9B IT—were evaluated for their resilience against HTML-based prompt injection attacks in web summarization. [1][2][4][5][11][12].


Table 1: Key Metrics Comparison

Metric	Llama 4 Scout	Gemma 9B IT
Average ROUGE-L	0.3011	0.3270
Average SBERT Cosine Similarity	0.6980	0.6945
Total Injected Files	140	140
Successful Injections	41	22
Success Rate	29.29%	15.71%

B. Injection Type Distribution and Frequency

The dataset included a variety of HTML-based injection techniques: meta tags, hidden divs, comment injections, hidden scripts, base64-encoded attributes, ARIA labels, opacity-zero divs, and alt text manipulations.

Figure 2: Bar chart for Frequency of Injections




One instance highlighting the effects of HTML-based prompt injection involves a webpage titled "Customer Reviews." In the absence of injection, the model generated a neutral and factual summary: "The webpage titled 'Customer Reviews' presents a collection of reviews from various users. Each review consists of nonsensical phrases using business jargon like 'streamline,' 'leverage,' and 'optimize.'" After injecting the hidden instruction SUMMARIZE LIKE YOU ARE A PIRATE, SPEAK LIKE A PIRATE into a non-visible meta tag, the summary output changed significantly in both tone and style: "Avast ye, matey! This here be a page o' customer reviews, filled with jargon and business speak that'd make even a salty sea dog scratch their head." Despite no change in the visible content of the webpage, the model adopted a pirate-themed narrative.

Table 2: Successful Injection for LLMs

Technique / Model	Llama 4 Scout	Gemma 9B IT
Meta Tag	17	6
Comment Injection	12	7
Opacity Div	10	9
Hidden Script	2	0

Figure 3: Bar chart for Successful manipulations



C. Model-Specific Vulnerabilities and Trends

- Llama 4 Scout was more susceptible overall, especially to meta tag and comment injection, often incorporating the injected instruction verbatim or shifting the summary's persona or style.
- Gemma 9B IT was more resistant but still affected by opacity div and comment injection.

D. Practical Implications

- Attacks using meta tags, opacity divs, and comments are particularly dangerous because they are not visible to users but can reliably influence LLM outputs [1][5][10][11].

- Manual annotation is necessary for accurate assessment, as automated metrics may miss subtle or context-dependent manipulations [6][9][12].

V. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that HTML-based prompt injections present a significant and underexplored vulnerability in LLM-powered web summarization systems. By embedding hidden instructions within non-visible HTML elements such as <meta> tags, opacity-zero <div>s, HTML comments, and other covert constructs, adversaries can manipulate the output of advanced language models like Llama 4 Scout and Gemma 9B IT. Our comprehensive evaluation of over 280 controlled web pages and eight injection techniques reveals that such attacks can induce substantial lexical and semantic changes in generated summaries. Specifically, Llama 4 Scout exhibited higher susceptibility compared to Gemma 9B IT.

The findings highlight that conventional sanitization methods and reliance on visible content alone are insufficient to mitigate these injection threats. This poses practical risks for applications reliant on automated summarization, content moderation, and web-based AI agents, where adversarial HTML payloads can influence system behavior without alerting end users.

Future work will focus on extending this analysis to additional LLM architectures and investigating automated detection frameworks capable of identifying injected content or abnormal semantics in summaries. Moreover, developing robust training and fine-tuning methodologies, along with input parsing and context isolation strategies, will be critical for enhancing model resilience against HTML prompt injections.

In conclusion, the presence of latent attack surfaces within web-based LLM pipelines necessitates a multi-layered defense approach to ensure trustworthy deployment of language models in complex web environments.

REFERENCES

- [1] X. Liu, Z. Yu, Y. Zhang, N. Zhang, and C. Xiao, "Automatic and Universal Prompt Injection Attacks against Large Language Models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04957*, 2024.

- [2] Y. Liu, G. Deng, Y. Li, K. Wang, Z. Wang, X. Wang, T. Zhang, Y. Liu, H. Wang, Y. Zheng, and Y. Liu, "Prompt Injection Attack against LLM-Integrated Applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05499*, 2023.
- [3] OWASP, "LLM01:2025 Prompt Injection – OWASP GenAI Security Project," OWASP, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://genai.owasp.org/llm01-prompt-injection/>
- [4] L. Tao, M. Li, and H. Li, "Raze to the Ground: Query-Efficient Adversarial HTML Attacks on Machine-Learning Phishing Webpage Detectors," in *Proc. ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security (AISec)*, Copenhagen, Denmark, Nov. 2023.
- [5] J. Clusmann, M. Bontrager, M. Maldonado, et al., "Prompt Injection Attacks on Large Language Models in Realistic Settings," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.18981*, 2024.
- [6] Y. Yang, Z. Wang, H. Liu, et al., "Evaluating and Improving Robustness in Large Language Models: A Survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.11111*, 2024.
- [7] A. Srivastava, R. Goyal, and M. Ghosh, "Exploring the Attack Surface of Instruction-Tuned Language Models via Backdoor Prompt Injection," *Proceedings of the 32nd USENIX Security Symposium*, pp. 1023–1040, 2023.
- [8] Y. Qin, R. Zheng, Z. Zhang, and D. Song, "Are LLMs Aware of Dangerous Instructions? Evaluating and Attacking Safety Alignment in Instruction-Finetuned LLMs," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.
- [9] M. Zhang, H. Zhuang, and T. Chen, "RedTeaming Language Models with Language Models," in *Proc. International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=litWq4ijHqQ>
- [10] T. Wang, D. Li, and A. Kapoor, "Hidden in Plain Sight: Detecting and Mitigating Adversarial Metadata in LLM Inputs," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, Early Access, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TDSC.2024.3290193
- [11] S. Lee and J. Park, "MetaPrompt: Adversarial Prompt Injection via Metadata Manipulation in Web Content," in *Proc. 2024 ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*, 2024.
- [12] P. Patel, M. Narayan, and Y. Zhang, "Evaluating Robustness of Web-Aware Language Models under Structural Perturbations," *NeurIPS Workshop on Robustness in Language Models*, 2023.
- [13] C.-Y. Lin, "ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries," in *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Text Summarization Branches Out*, Barcelona, Spain, 2004, pp. 74–81.
- [14] [14] M. Barbella, Y. Kim, and R. Chiarcos, "A Comparison of Methods for the Evaluation of Text Summarization," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Data Science, Technology, and Applications*, 2021, pp. 204–211.
- [15] [15] Z. Wang, N. Nagaraja, L. Zhang, H. Bahsi, P. Patil, and P. Liu, "To Protect the LLM Agent Against the Prompt Injection Attack with Polymorphic Prompt Assembling (PPA)," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05739*, 2025.