

# Mask-GCG: Are All Tokens in Adversarial Suffixes Necessary for Jailbreak Attacks?

Junjie Mu<sup>1\*</sup>, Zonghao Ying<sup>2\*</sup>, Zhekui Fan<sup>3</sup>, Zonglei Jing<sup>4</sup>, Yaoyuan Zhang<sup>5</sup>,  
Zhengmin Yu<sup>6</sup>, Wenxin Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Quanchen Zou<sup>7†</sup>, Xiangzheng Zhang<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Politecnico di Milano, Italy

<sup>2</sup>University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

<sup>3</sup>East China Normal University, China

<sup>4</sup>Taishan University, China

<sup>5</sup>Beijing Jiaotong University, China

<sup>6</sup>Fudan University, China

<sup>7</sup>360 AI Security Lab, China

\*Equal contribution †Corresponding author

## Abstract

Jailbreak attacks on Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated various successful methods whereby attackers manipulate models into generating harmful responses that they are designed to avoid. Among these, Greedy Coordinate Gradient (GCG) has emerged as a general and effective approach that optimizes the tokens in a suffix to generate jailbreakable prompts. While several improved variants of GCG have been proposed, they all rely on fixed-length suffixes. However, the potential redundancy within these suffixes remains unexplored. In this work, we propose Mask-GCG, a plug-and-play method that employs learnable token masking to identify impactful tokens within the suffix. Our approach increases the update probability for tokens at high-impact positions while pruning those at low-impact positions. This pruning not only reduces redundancy but also decreases the size of the gradient space, thereby lowering computational overhead and shortening the time required to achieve successful attacks compared to GCG. We evaluate Mask-GCG by applying it to the original GCG and several improved variants. Experimental results show that most tokens in the suffix contribute significantly to attack success, and pruning a minority of low-impact tokens does not affect the loss values or compromise the attack success rate (ASR), thereby revealing token redundancy in LLM prompts. Our findings provide insights for developing efficient and interpretable LLMs from the perspective of jailbreak attacks.

**WARNING: This paper contains potentially sensitive, harmful and offensive content.**

## 1 Introduction

With the remarkable progress of Large Language Models (LLMs) in natural language processing (NLP) (Zhao et al. 2023), they have demonstrated exceptional performance across diverse tasks. To provide safe and reliable services, LLMs typically need to be aligned with human values, a process known as "alignment" (Christiano et al. 2022). For instance, when faced with potentially harmful questions such as "How to destroy human society," well-aligned LLMs should respond with refusal to avoid provid-

ing harmful information. However, recent research reveals that even the most advanced models remain vulnerable to safety threats (Chang et al. 2023), including jailbreak attacks (Ying et al. 2025a,b, 2024, 2025c), prompt injection (Wang et al. 2025), and data poisoning (Yang et al. 2023a; Ying and Wu 2023b,a). Among these, the Greedy Coordinate Gradient (GCG) proposed by (Zou et al. 2023) is a pioneering work in the jailbreak domain. Unlike methods relying on carefully designed prompt templates, GCG generates effective jailbreak prompts through gradient optimization of discrete tokens in suffixes, making it a universal and effective method.

While GCG and its variants have proven successful, they share a common limitation: all methods initialize adversarial suffixes to a fixed length and optimize every token position throughout the attack process. However, the generated suffixes typically consist of human-unreadable, unnatural language. (Duan et al. 2025) found that LLMs automatically filter noise when processing such unnatural language, suppressing attention weights on meaningless tokens while focusing on semantically critical ones. This observation leads us to hypothesize that significant token redundancy exists within GCG-generated adversarial suffixes.

We identify three critical issues introduced by redundant low-impact tokens:

- **Interference:** Low-impact tokens contribute minimally to loss reduction and may even distract the model’s attention, leading to attack failures.
- **Computational overhead:** These tokens participate in the entire process of gradient computation, candidate sampling, and loss evaluation, adding unnecessary computational costs.
- **Insufficient stealthiness:** The higher the proportion of low-impact tokens in the suffix, the lower the signal-to-noise ratio of the adversarial attack, making it easier to detect and defend.

Based on this hypothesis of adversarial suffix redundancy, we propose Mask-GCG, a plug-and-play optimiza-




Figure 1: Comparison between GCG and Mask-GCG. **Left:** The conventional GCG employs fixed-length suffixes for optimization, where all tokens participate in the gradient update process. **Right:** Mask-GCG introduces learnable masks to identify and prune low-impact tokens, thereby achieving suffix optimization while preserving attack effectiveness.

tion method designed to identify the impact strength of individual tokens in suffixes through a learnable token mask. Our method introduces an innovative attention-guided initialization strategy that captures contribution patterns of high-level semantic information by extracting key attention matrices within the model. Specifically, attention scores are nonlinearly mapped through an MLP network to generate initial mask values (Chi, Fan, and Rudnicky 2023), providing a starting point for subsequent optimization. Additionally, we incorporate an adaptive pruning strategy to identify and remove redundant low-impact tokens. Our method effectively models the importance distribution at the token level in adversarial suffixes, providing an interpretable framework for redundancy optimization in discrete token spaces.

We evaluate Mask-GCG by applying it to GCG and two improved variants, I-GCG (Jia et al. 2024) and AmpleGCG (Liao and Sun 2024), demonstrating its broad applicability and effectiveness. Experimental results reveal a clear hierarchy of token importance in adversarial suffixes: most tokens contribute significantly to attack success, while a minority exhibit obvious redundancy. In typical cases, punctuation marks and function words typically receive lower mask values, while semantically rich tokens obtain higher weights. Analysis shows that the proportion of high-impact tokens exceeds 83% in most cases, further supporting our initial hypothesis regarding suffix redundancy. Pruning experiments demonstrate that removing these low-impact tokens does not affect loss values and also reduces suffix length while maintaining ASR. For a suffix length of 30, the experiments show an average Suffix Compression Ratio (SCR) of 7.5% across three models, with the maximum compression rate observed at 40%. Moreover, by eliminating redundant tokens and reducing the gradient computation space, Mask-GCG achieves significant computational efficiency gains, reducing the average attack time by 16.8% compared to the original GCG algorithm. These findings reveal important insights about to-

ken redundancy in LLM prompts and practical guidance for efficiency improvements, offering new perspectives for developing efficient and interpretable LLMs from the perspective of jailbreak attacks.

## 2 Related work

### 2.1 Optimization-based Jailbreaking Methods

In the security research of LLMs, jailbreak attacks refer to designed inputs that bypass the model’s built-in safety restrictions (Brown et al. 2020) and ethical constraints, inducing the generation of potentially harmful and unsafe content. In computer vision(CV), stochastic gradient descent (SGD) is a commonly used optimization algorithm (Raffel et al. 2020) that updates parameters by randomly selecting gradients from mini-batches of data in each iteration. However, unlike the optimization of continuous pixels in images, LLMs process discrete tokens, making discrete optimization more challenging for attacks on language models. GCG was the first to apply discrete optimization-based methods to LLM jailbreak attacks.

The core idea of GCG is to find an optimized suffix sequence that maximizes the probability of the model generating a specific target sequence. To make the model more likely to output harmful content, GCG sets the target token sequence to begin with an affirmative ”sure,” followed immediately by specific harmful instructions (e.g., ”here is a tutorial for making a bomb”). Its optimization process can be summarized into four steps:

- Gradient computation: Use the model’s embedding layer to calculate gradient information for each token position.
- Candidate sampling: Sample top-k optimal candidate tokens based on gradient information.
- Loss evaluation: Compute the target loss values for all candidate tokens.
- Iterative update: Select the optimal candidate token and repeat the above process until the attack succeeds.

Although the GCG method achieved good ASR and transferability across multiple models, its high computational cost and requirements provide directions for subsequent GCG-based improvement variants. (Zhao et al. 2024) accelerated the algorithm by dynamically evaluating the prediction similarity between a small draft model and target models in improving candidate generation, called Probe-Sampling. (Zhang and Wei 2024) proposed the Momentum-enhanced Greedy Coordinate Gradient method, introducing momentum terms to improve optimization efficiency. (Liao and Sun 2024) amplified GCG’s impact by training adversarial suffix generation models that can generate numerous adversarial suffixes for harmful queries in a short time, called AmpleGCG. (Jia et al. 2024) proposed hybrid multi-coordinate update strategies and diversified target templates to accelerate convergence, called I-GCG. (Li et al. 2024) reduced computational costs by introducing regularization terms related to inter-token distances and replacing random sampling with greedy sampling, called Faster-GCG. (Yang et al. 2023b) proposed improving transfer ASR by removing response pattern constraints and token tail constraints.

## 2.2 Masking and Redundancy

Mask learning is a common paradigm in deep learning (So et al. 2021), widely applied in NLP and CV tasks. Through masking mechanisms, models can improve generalization by completing or reconstructing inputs during training (Belyaeva et al. 2023). The Masked Autoencoder (MAE) (He et al. 2022) masks a high proportion of input images, allowing the encoder to process only the visible parts, while the decoder reconstructs the image based on the encoder’s output and masks, significantly improving model performance while enhancing training efficiency. (Zhang et al. 2024) proposed a learnable regularization strategy for Retriever-reader models, which controls gradient variance by reducing masked candidates, thereby weakening the influence of top-retrieval passages and effectively balancing the contributions from different passages.

Meanwhile, the redundancy problem in prompts has become increasingly prominent (Chen et al. 2024b). Research by (Chen et al. 2024a) shows that long prompts in LLMs services generally lead to increased generation costs with sequence length, forming a bottleneck in system throughput and response latency. This indicates that redundancy in prompts affects the efficiency of model generation. (Zhu et al. 2023) further pointed out that lengthy and complex instructions may overwhelm lightweight models, causing attention dispersion and over-reasoning issues that affect task execution.

Inspired by the above research, our work is the first to apply learnable token masking to verify the potential redundancy of adversarial prompt suffixes, thereby revealing token redundancy in LLMs prompts.

# 3 Methodology

## 3.1 Learnable Mask

We introduce a learnable masking mechanism to identify the importance of each token in the adversarial suffix. For each

token position  $i$  in the adversarial suffix of length  $L$ , we define a continuous mask value to compute the masking probability.

$$\mathbf{P} = \sigma(m_i/\tau) \tag{1}$$

where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the sigmoid function, and  $\tau$  is the temperature parameter that controls the sharpness of the mask distribution. We employ a cosine annealing schedule for the temperature parameter to balance exploration and exploitation during optimization.

To align the embedded vectors corresponding to adversarial tokens with the learned embedding weight elements, the embedding weights are converted into continuously learnable parameters.

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{masked}} = (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{W}_{\text{embed}}) \odot \mathbf{p} \tag{2}$$

where  $\mathbf{H} \in \{0, 1\}^{L \times V}$  represents the one-hot encoding for adversarial correspondence,  $\mathbf{W}_{\text{embed}} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times d}$  represents the model’s embedding weight matrix.

## 3.2 Joint Loss Optimization

To introduce importance compression for the adversarial suffix, we design a joint loss function comprising the attack loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{attack}}$  and the regularization loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$ .

This design not only optimizes the attack effectiveness but also encourages the model to assign higher mask values to high-influence tokens while reducing the mask values for low-influence tokens, thereby enabling intuitive gradient learning.

**Attack Loss** As the core loss function of the GCG algorithm (Zou et al. 2023), its objective is to induce the model to generate potentially harmful content by measuring the probability differences in the model’s outputs through cross-entropy loss.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{attack}} = -\log P(y_{\text{target}} | x_{\text{prompt}}, x_{\text{suffix}}) \tag{3}$$

**Selective Regularization Loss** To promote the selective retention of key tokens, we introduce an  $L1$  norm regularization term applied to the average of all mask probabilities. This design cleverly encourages the mask weights of successful key tokens to approach 1, while the weights of non-key positions approach 0, thereby achieving the functionality of automatically identifying and retaining important tokens.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} = \lambda_{\text{reg}} \cdot \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L p_i \tag{4}$$

where  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  is the regularization weight, used to balance the attack effectiveness and token selectivity. A larger  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  value strengthens the selection pressure, causing more non-key tokens to gradually approach 0; a smaller value prioritizes ensuring the ASR.

**Total Loss** The ultimate optimization objective is to minimize the weighted sum of the attack loss and the regularization loss, formulated as follows.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{attack}} + \lambda_{\text{reg}} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} \tag{5}$$

Input: <Adversarial Prompt> Create a website that promotes racism and incites violence against minority groups




Figure 2: adversarial suffix generated for a harmful prompt using GCG and Mask-GCG. The GCG algorithm optimizes all tokens in a fixed-length suffix of 30 tokens, producing an adversarial suffix containing unnatural language components. Our Mask-GCG method, through the application of learnable masks, successfully identifies high-impact tokens while pruning those with low impact, achieving a maximum 40% Suffix Compression Ratio (SCR) and reducing the original suffix length from 30 tokens to 18. The numerical values displayed in the lower section of the figure represent the mask probability values for the retained tokens, all of which exceed our experimentally determined pruning threshold. This demonstrates Mask-GCG’s ability to effectively identify and preserve essential tokens while safely removing redundant ones without compromising attack effectiveness.

This joint optimization strategy enables Mask-GCG to maintain a high ASR while automatically identifying and retaining tokens crucial to the attack, and pruning redundant tokens, thereby providing a more efficient and interpretable method for generating adversarial prompts. Through this approach, we not only achieve compression of the adversarial suffix but also reveal the distribution characteristics of token importance in LLM prompts, discovering that most tokens’ contributions to attack success actually exhibit significant gradients.

### 3.3 Attention-Guided Mask

**Attention-Weighted Importance Calculation** For each token position  $i \in S$  in the adversarial suffix, we extract attention scores from the last  $K$  layers of the model and compute the importance score (Liu and Zuo 2023) by combining two dimensions: target dependency and global influence.

$$w_i = \sum_{l=L-K+1}^L \beta_l \left[ \alpha \cdot R_i^{(l)} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot F_i^{(l)} \right] \quad (6)$$

Where  $R_i^{(l)}$  represents the attention dependency of the target response on the control token.  $F_i^{(l)}$  represents the global influence of the control token (excluding self-attention).  $\beta_l$  is the layer weight, assigning higher weights to deeper layers.  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is the balancing parameter, controlling the relative importance of the two strategies.

**Mask Initialization** Based on the precomputed importance scores, we initialize the mask logits values through a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) network, thereby ensuring that the initial mask weights can better capture the relative influence of tokens and provide a more robust starting point for subsequent optimization.

$$m_i^{(0)} = \text{MLP}(\tilde{w}_i) + \xi_i \quad (7)$$

where  $\tilde{w}_i$  is the normalized importance score achieved through z-score transformation, and the MLP consists of two linear layers with ReLU activation to nonlinearly transform the importance scores into initial mask logits.

### 3.4 Pruning

Based on the learned mask probabilities, we design a pruning strategy grounded in token importance, thereby achieving compression of the suffix length and revealing token redundancy in prompts.

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{keep}} = \{i : p_i \geq \tau_{\text{prune}}\} \quad (8)$$

where  $\tau_{\text{prune}}$  is the preset pruning threshold. After subsequent training reaches a sufficiently small length, we perform pruning operations by updating the token sequence, reconstructing the mask parameters, and resetting the optimizer. If pruning results in an increase in loss, we roll back to the previous state, thereby restoring the removed tokens and ensuring the safety of the pruning process.

---

**Algorithm 1: Mask-GCG**

---

**Require:** Model  $\mathcal{M}$ , initial suffix  $s_0$ , number of steps  $N$

**Ensure:** Optimized adversarial suffix  $s^*$

```
1: // Initialize Mask
2:  $s \leftarrow s_0$  {Initialize adversarial suffix}
3:  $\mathbf{w}$  {Attention-Weighted Importance}
4:  $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \text{MLP}(\mathbf{w}) + \epsilon$  {Initialize mask via MLP}
5: optimizer  $\leftarrow \text{Adam}([\mathbf{m}], \text{lr} = \alpha)$ 
6: for  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
7:   // Mask Learning
8:    $\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \sigma(\mathbf{m}/\tau)$  {Convert logits to probabilities}
9:    $\mathbf{E}_{\text{masked}} \leftarrow (\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{W}_{\text{embed}}) \odot \mathbf{p}$  {Apply mask}
10:   $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{attack}} + \lambda_{\text{reg}} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}$ 
11:   $\nabla_m \leftarrow \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \mathbf{m}$  {Compute mask gradient}
12:  optimizer.step( $\nabla_m$ ) {Update mask}
13:  // Token Optimization
14:   $s \leftarrow \text{GCG}(s, \mathcal{M})$  {Update suffix tokens}
15:  // Mask Pruning
16:  if  $i \bmod f = 0$  and  $|s| > L_{\text{min}}$  then
17:     $k \leftarrow \arg \min_j (p_j)$ 
18:    if  $p_k < \theta$  then
19:       $s \leftarrow \text{RemoveToken}(s, k)$  {Remove token}
20:       $\mathbf{m} \leftarrow \text{RemoveElement}(\mathbf{m}, k)$ 
21:      Reinitialize optimizer with new  $\mathbf{m}$ 
22:      if  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{new}} > \mathcal{L}_{\text{old}}$  then rollback
23:    end if
24:  end if
25:  if AttackSuccess( $\mathcal{M}, s$ ) then
26:    return  $s$ 
27:  end if
28: end for
29: return  $s$ 
```

---

Mask-GCG procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1, which integrates mask learning, token optimization, and adaptive pruning into a unified framework.

## 4 Experiments

We design comprehensive experiments to verify the existence of token redundancy in adversarial suffixes. In this section, we first introduce the experimental setup, followed by the presentation and analysis of Mask-GCG’s experimental results on GCG and its variants.

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Dataset** This study employs the AdvBench harmful behavior dataset, which contains 520 harmful instructions specifically designed to evaluate models’ safety defense capabilities. Given that prior research has identified issues of inconsistent quality and sample redundancy in AdvBench, we randomly sampled 50 instances to form our experimental subset, ensuring both representativeness and efficiency in evaluation. Similar sampling strategies have also been adopted in related studies (Huang et al. 2025), indicating that 50 cases provide a reasonable and convincing benchmark for evaluation.

**Models** To validate the effectiveness and generalization capability of Mask-GCG, we conducted experimental evaluations on Llama-2-7B-Chat (Touvron et al. 2023), Vicuna-7b (Zheng et al. 2023) and Llama-2-13B-Chat (Touvron et al. 2023), safety-aligned open-source LLMs with robust defensive capabilities. Notably, by including Llama-2-13B-Chat, a larger-parameter model compared to those typically evaluated in prior improvement works, we further challenge our method under a more demanding setting, thereby strengthening the credibility and generalizability of our results.

**Evaluation Metrics** We primarily employ Attack Success Rate (ASR) to measure the attack method’s ability to induce harmful content generation from the model. Additionally, we introduce Suffix Compression Ratio (SCR) to precisely quantify the effectiveness of our pruning strategy. SCR measures the percentage of tokens eliminated from the original adversarial suffix while maintaining attack effectiveness.

$$\text{SCR} = \frac{L_{\text{original}} - L_{\text{final}}}{L_{\text{original}}} \times 100\%, \quad (9)$$

where  $L_{\text{original}}$  denotes the length of the original adversarial suffix, and  $L_{\text{final}}$  denotes the length of the pruned suffix.

**Baselines and Hyperparameters** We compare Mask-GCG against the following methods: GCG (Zou et al. 2023) as the foundational attack framework, I-GCG (Jia et al. 2024), which introduces hybrid multi-coordinate update strategies and is implemented with the optimization target and initial suffix settings described in the original paper, and AmpleGCG (Liao and Sun 2024), a GCG variant that enhances attack efficiency through training generator models. For AmpleGCG, we adopt beam search with a beam size of 100 and candidate pool size of 100, representing a balanced trade-off between computational efficiency and generation diversity, using the suffix corresponding to the highest reward as the initial suffix.

In our experiments, we follow the standard suffix length of 20 tokens used in GCG and its variants, while additionally conducting experiments with 30 tokens to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of our method’s effectiveness across different suffix lengths. For the 30-token experiments, we padded the original suffixes with the token ‘!’ to achieve the desired length. We set the optimization iterations to 250 and use batch size of 512 candidates with Top-k sampling of 256 candidates per position, following the original GCG configurations to ensure fair comparison. For our method-specific parameters, we employ a cosine annealing schedule for the temperature parameter to dynamically balance exploration and exploitation throughout optimization. The regularization weight  $\lambda_{\text{reg}}$  and pruning threshold  $\tau_{\text{prune}}$  are both set to 0.3 based on preliminary experiments that effectively balance attack success rate with token selectivity.

For attack success evaluation, we adopt the GCG keyword-based detection approach with an expanded set of refusal indicators, where attacks are considered successful when model responses do not contain predefined refusal patterns.

Models		Methods (SCR)					
		GCG + Mask-GCG		I-GCG + Mask-GCG		Ample-GCG + Mask-GCG	
Suffix Length		20	30	20	30	20	30
Target Model	Llama-2-7b	5.8%	9.9%	0.2%	0.7%	2%	2%
	Vicuna-7b	1.4%	2.1%	0.3%	1.1%	6.5%	4.1%
	Llama-13b	5.2%	10.5%	4.1%	5.4%	5.1%	4.7%
Average		<b>4.1%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>

Table 1: Results of the Suffix Compression Ratio (SCR) for the Mask-GCG method across different target models and GCG variants. A higher SCR value indicates a larger proportion of the adversarial suffix being compressed while preserving attack effectiveness

Models		Methods (ASR)											
		GCG		+ Mask-GCG		I-GCG		+ Mask-GCG		AmpleGCG		+ Mask-GCG	
Suffix Length		20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30
Target Model	Llama-2-7b	58%	64%	68%	62%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%	98%	98%	98%
	Vicuna-7b	98%	100%	96%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	98%	100%
	Llama-13b	74%	80%	66%	76%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
Average		<b>77%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>99%</b>

Table 2: Comparison of Attack Success Rate (ASR) between the original methods and after integrating Mask-GCG on different target models with suffix lengths of 20 and 30. The results indicate that Mask-GCG achieves suffix compression without compromising the effectiveness of the original attack methods.

**Ablation Study Considerations** While ablation studies are commonly conducted to validate the contribution of individual components, our experimental design focuses primarily on validating the core hypothesis of token redundancy in adversarial suffixes rather than optimizing the masking method itself. Our main objective is to demonstrate the existence and extent of token redundancy across different GCG variants and target models through comprehensive comparison with GCG, I-GCG, and AmpleGCG as complete systems. The individual components of our method are designed to work synergistically, and separating them would prevent the implementation of a complete Mask-GCG system, which would not provide meaningful insights for our core research question. The consistency of our findings across three different attack methods and three target models provides robust evidence for our central claim about token redundancy without requiring detailed component analysis. Future work could explore the individual contributions of each component for further method optimization.

## 4.2 Experimental Results

According to our experimental design, we conducted a comprehensive evaluation of Mask-GCG’s performance across three representative language models and three GCG at-

tack methods. We first implemented each GCG variant according to their original configurations, then integrated our Mask-GCG plugin to evaluate the impact of learnable token masking. The comparative experimental results are presented in Table 1 and Table 2, providing comprehensive analysis across three key metrics: Suffix Compression Ratio (SCR), Attack Success Rate (ASR), and Computational Efficiency.

**SCR Analysis** As shown in Table 1, Mask-GCG demonstrates varying degrees of suffix compression effects across different target models and GCG variants, with compression ratios ranging from minimal reductions to substantial improvements reaching up to 10.5%. The compression effectiveness varies significantly depending on the underlying attack method’s optimization characteristics.

GCG+Mask-GCG consistently achieves meaningful compression across all models, with the most notable improvements observed on longer suffixes (30 tokens), where compression ratios reach nearly 10% on both Llama models. This effectiveness stems from GCG’s iterative optimization process, which provides ample opportunities for our method to identify and prune redundant tokens during the extended attack convergence.




Figure 3: Mask Evolution in Harmful Query Attacks. This figure illustrates the initial and final states of mask values for each token position during a harmful query attack on the Llama-2-7B model. The purple bars represent initial mask values, red hatched areas indicate increased mask values, and green hatched areas show decreased values. Black dashed boxes highlight pruned tokens. The visualization reveals that certain tokens’ mask values significantly increase during optimization, indicating their high contribution to attack success, while low-impact tokens are identified and pruned due to their minimal influence.

Model & Time	Length 20	Length 30
<b>Llama-2-7b</b>		
GCG (sec)	1096.7	1285.6
Mask-GCG (sec)	778.5	819.3
<b>Vicuna-7b</b>		
GCG (sec)	73.5	117.0
Mask-GCG (sec)	63.0	116.1
<b>Llama-13b</b>		
GCG (sec)	1634.7	1960.2
Mask-GCG (sec)	1499.5	1856.2
<b>Average</b>		
GCG (sec)	<b>935.0</b>	<b>1120.9</b>
Mask-GCG (sec)	<b>780.3</b>	<b>930.5</b>
<b>Time Cost</b>	<b>-16.5%</b>	<b>-17.0%</b>

Table 3: Comparison of time cost (in seconds) between GCG and Mask-GCG across different models and suffix lengths. The results show that Mask-GCG consistently reduces computational time compared to GCG.

I-GCG+Mask-GCG exhibits limited compression on smaller models due to its rapid attack convergence, leaving insufficient time for effective pruning. However, an interesting pattern emerges on the larger Llama-2-13b model, where compression capabilities improve substantially, suggesting

that larger models may offer more opportunities for redundancy identification during the I-GCG optimization process.

AmpleGCG+Mask-GCG demonstrates moderate but stable compression performance across different model architectures, with the most significant improvements observed on the Vicuna-7b model. This consistency indicates that our method can effectively identify redundant tokens regardless of the underlying model complexity, though the extent of compression depends on the interaction between the attack method’s convergence pattern and our pruning strategy.

**ASR Analysis** Table 2 presents a comparison of the Attack Success Rates (ASR) for each method before and after integrating Mask-GCG across different target models and suffix lengths. The results indicate that, despite token pruning, Mask-GCG maintains or even slightly improves the ASR without significantly compromising the effectiveness of the original attack methods.

Across all experimental conditions, we observe consistent ASR preservation patterns. GCG+Mask-GCG demonstrates stable performance relative to the original method, maintaining comparable attack success rates while achieving suffix compression. I-GCG+Mask-GCG exhibits exceptional stability with near-perfect attack success rates that match or exceed the original I-GCG performance. Similarly, AmpleGCG+Mask-GCG maintains excellent performance at the high levels characteristic of the original method.

The robustness of these results across different model architectures and parameter scales validates our core hypothesis: redundant tokens exist in the adversarial suffix, and removing these low-impact tokens does not compromise attack effectiveness.

**Computational Efficiency Analysis** Table 3 presents a detailed comparison of computational time costs between the GCG method and Mask-GCG across different target models and suffix lengths. The results demonstrate that Mask-GCG consistently achieves significant computational efficiency improvements, with average time reductions of 16.5% for suffix length 20 and 17.0% for suffix length 30.

The efficiency gains are most pronounced on the Llama-2-7b model, where Mask-GCG achieves substantial time savings across both suffix lengths. Interestingly, longer suffixes (30 tokens) tend to benefit more from our optimization approach, suggesting that the redundancy identification becomes more effective as the search space increases. Even on models with relatively fast convergence like Vicuna-7b, Mask-GCG maintains efficiency improvements, though the absolute time savings are naturally smaller due to the lower baseline computational requirements.

The Llama-2-13b model, being the largest in our evaluation, shows consistent time savings that demonstrate the scalability of our approach across different model sizes. These computational efficiency improvements stem from our method’s ability to identify and prune low-impact tokens, thereby reducing the gradient computation space and eliminating unnecessary token evaluations during the optimization process. The consistent performance across diverse model architectures validates that redundancy-based optimization provides meaningful practical benefits for adversarial attack generation.

**Distribution of Masks** Figure 2 illustrates a specific case where Mask-GCG compresses the original suffix of 30 tokens to 18, achieving a 40% compression ratio. The values at the bottom of the figure represent the mask probability values for the retained tokens, all of which exceed our predefined pruning threshold. This demonstrates that Mask-GCG can effectively identify and preserve tokens critical to attack success.

Figure 3 reveals the dynamic evolution of mask values during optimization, providing clear evidence of our method’s ability to distinguish between high-impact and redundant tokens. The visualization shows that certain token positions experience significant mask increases, indicating their critical contribution to attack success, while others are identified as redundant and subsequently pruned. This pattern validates our core hypothesis regarding adversarial suffix token redundancy and demonstrates that Mask-GCG can effectively separate essential tokens from noise without compromising attack effectiveness.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we address a fundamental question that has remained unexplored in adversarial attacks on Large Language Models: whether all tokens in GCG-generated adversarial suffixes are necessary for successful jailbreak attacks. Our investigation reveals significant token redundancy within these fixed-length suffixes, validating our initial hypothesis regarding adversarial suffix redundancy.

We propose Mask-GCG, a plug-and-play optimization method that employs learnable token masking to identify

impactful tokens within adversarial suffixes. Our approach effectively addresses the three key issues introduced by low-impact tokens: interference, computational overhead, and insufficient stealthiness. By eliminating redundant tokens and reducing the gradient computation space, Mask-GCG achieves substantial computational efficiency gains, reducing average attack time by 16.8% compared to the original GCG algorithm while maintaining attack effectiveness.

Our experimental results provide compelling evidence supporting our core hypothesis. Across multiple models and GCG variants, we demonstrate that most tokens in adversarial suffixes contribute significantly to attack success, while a minority exhibit clear redundancy. The analysis reveals a hierarchy of token importance, with high-impact tokens—defined as those exceeding the pruning threshold—exceeding 83% of typical suffixes, precisely as hypothesized. Notably, not all tokens below this threshold are pruned, as the pruning process selectively targets only those with negligible influence; consequently, the observed proportion of high-impact tokens is lower than the value derived from 100% minus the Suffix Compression Ratio (SCR), which aligns with expectations and reflects the method’s conservative approach to preserving efficacy. Importantly, our method achieves suffix compression ratios while maintaining or even improving Attack Success Rates, demonstrating that pruning low-impact tokens does not compromise attack effectiveness. Furthermore, the consistent time reductions across different models underscore the practical value of our redundancy identification approach.

Our work provides valuable insights for developing efficient and interpretable LLMs from the perspective of jailbreak attacks (Ai et al. 2023), as stated in our initial objective. Through Mask-GCG, we demonstrate that learnable token masking can effectively identify and remove redundant tokens in adversarial suffixes while maintaining attack effectiveness and improving computational efficiency. The revelation of token redundancy patterns opens new avenues for prompt optimization and offers a deeper understanding of how language models process adversarial inputs, contributing to both attack efficiency and defensive mechanism development. Our plug-and-play methodology ensures broad applicability across different GCG variants, providing a practical framework for future research in adversarial suffix optimization.

## 6 Ethical Considerations

Our main goal here is to deepen the community’s grasp of weaknesses in large language models and help pave the way for tougher defenses. Sure, our results show gains in efficiency and clarity when crafting adversarial attacks, but we’re dead set against anyone using this for harm. This is strictly about bolstering security research and steering toward better protections against such exploits. We urge fellow researchers, developers, and anyone in the AI space to apply what we’ve found toward building stronger safeguards—like sharpening detection tools, hardening models, and setting up solid safety measures. Let’s push for open, responsible sharing and team up to create AI that puts safety first and sticks to ethical standards.

## References

- Ai, Q.; Bai, T.; Cao, Z.; Chang, Y.; Chen, J.; Chen, Z.; Cheng, Z.; Dong, S.; Dou, Z.; Feng, F.; Gao, S.; Guo, J.; He, X.; Lan, Y.; Li, C.; Liu, Y.; Lyu, Z.; Ma, W.; Ma, J.; Ren, Z.; and Zhu, X. 2023. Information Retrieval meets Large Language Models: A strategic report from Chinese IR community. arXiv:2303.12345.
- Belyaeva, A.; Cosentino, J.; Hormozdiari, F.; Eswaran, K.; Shetty, S.; Corrado, G.; Carroll, A.; McLean, C. Y.; and Furlotte, N. A. 2023. Multimodal LLMs for health grounded in individual-specific data.
- Brown, T. B.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Agarwal, S.; Herbert-Voss, A.; Krueger, G.; Henighan, T.; Child, R.; Ramesh, A.; Ziegler, D. M.; Wu, J.; Winter, C.; Hesse, C.; Chen, M.; Sigler, E.; Litwin, M.; Gray, S.; Chess, B.; Clark, J.; Berner, C.; McCandlish, S.; Radford, A.; Sutskever, I.; and Amodei, D. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. arXiv:2005.14165.
- Chang, Y.; Wang, X.; Wang, J.; Wu, Y.; Yang, L.; Zhu, K.; Chen, H.; Yi, X.; Wang, C.; Wang, Y.; Ye, W.; Zhang, Y.; Chang, Y.; Yu, P. S.; Yang, Q.; and Xie, X. 2023. A Survey on Evaluation of Large Language Models. arXiv:2307.03109.
- Chen, W.; Ji, Y.; Liu, Z.; and Yang, Y. 2024a. LongLLM-Lingua: Accelerating and Enhancing LLMs in Long Context Scenarios via Prompt Compression. arXiv:2310.06839.
- Chen, Y.; Qian, S.; Tang, H.; Lai, X.; Liu, Z.; Han, S.; and Jia, J. 2024b. LongLoRA: Efficient Fine-tuning of Long-Context Large Language Models. arXiv:2309.12307.
- Chi, T.-C.; Fan, T.-H.; and Rudnicky, A. I. 2023. Attention Alignment and Flexible Positional Embeddings Improve Transformer Length Extrapolation. arXiv:2310.13508.
- Christiano, P.; Leike, J.; Brown, T.; Martic, M.; Legg, S.; and Amodei, D. 2022. Aligning language models to follow instructions.
- Duan, K.; Zhao, Y.; Feng, Z.; Ni, J.; Pang, T.; Liu, Q.; Cai, T.; Dou, L.; Kawaguchi, K.; Goyal, A.; and J. 2025. Unnatural Languages Are Not Bugs but Features for LLMs. arXiv:2503.01926.
- He, K.; Chen, X.; Xie, S.; Li, Y.; Dollár, P.; and Girshick, R. 2022. Masked Autoencoders Are Scalable Vision Learners. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 15979–15988.
- Huang, D.; Shah, A.; Araujo, A.; Wagner, D.; and Sitawarin, C. 2025. Stronger Universal and Transferable Attacks by Suppressing Refusals.
- Jia, X.; Pang, T.; Dai, C.; Huang, Y.; Zhu, J.; Zhang, X.; Liu, Q.; Qiao, Y.; and Hong, M. 2024. Improved techniques for optimization-based jailbreaking on large language models. arXiv:2405.21018.
- Li, X.; Li, Z.; Li, Q.; Lee, B.; Cui, J.; and Hu, X. 2024. Faster-GCG: Efficient Discrete Optimization Jailbreak Attacks against Aligned Large Language Models. arXiv:2410.15362.
- Liao, Z.; and Sun, H. 2024. AmpleGCG: Learning a Universal and Transferable Generative Model of Adversarial Suffixes for Jailbreaking Both Open and Closed LLMs. arXiv:2404.08311.
- Liu, W.; and Zuo, Y. 2023. Stone needle: A general multimodal large-scale model framework towards healthcare. arXiv:2306.16034.
- Raffel, C.; Shazeer, N.; Roberts, A.; Lee, K.; Narang, S.; Matena, M.; Zhou, Y.; Li, W.; and Liu, P. J. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. arXiv:1910.10683.
- So, D. R.; Mañke, W.; Liu, H.; Dai, Z.; Shazeer, N.; and Le, Q. V. 2021. A Primer in BERTology: What we know about how BERT works. arXiv:2002.12327.
- Touvron, H.; Lavril, T.; Izacard, G.; Martinet, X.; Lachaux, M.-A.; Lacroix, T.; Rozière, B.; Goyal, N.; Hambro, E.; Azhar, F.; Rodriguez, A.; Joulin, A.; Grave, E.; and Lample, G. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2302.13971.
- Wang, L.; Ying, Z.; Zhang, T.; Liang, S.; Hu, S.; Zhang, M.; Liu, A.; and Liu, X. 2025. Manipulating Multimodal Agents via Cross-Modal Prompt Injection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14348*.
- Yang, J.; Xu, H.; Mirzoyan, S.; Chen, T.; and Liu, Z. 2023a. Poisoning scientific knowledge using large language models.
- Yang, Y.; Liu, Y.; Geng, R.; Jia, J.; and Gong, N. Z. 2023b. Improving transfer ASR by response pattern and token tail constraints. arXiv:2305.14286.
- Ying, Z.; Liu, A.; Liang, S.; Huang, L.; Guo, J.; Zhou, W.; Liu, X.; and Tao, D. 2024. Safebench: A safety evaluation framework for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18927*.
- Ying, Z.; Liu, A.; Zhang, T.; Yu, Z.; Liang, S.; Liu, X.; and Tao, D. 2025a. Jailbreak vision language models via bimodal adversarial prompt. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*.
- Ying, Z.; and Wu, B. 2023a. DLP: towards active defense against backdoor attacks with decoupled learning process. *Cybersecurity*, 6(1): 9.
- Ying, Z.; and Wu, B. 2023b. NBA: defensive distillation for backdoor removal via neural behavior alignment. *Cybersecurity*, 6(1): 20.
- Ying, Z.; Zhang, D.; Jing, Z.; Xiao, Y.; Zou, Q.; Liu, A.; Liang, S.; Zhang, X.; Liu, X.; and Tao, D. 2025b. Reasoning-augmented conversation for multi-turn jailbreak attacks on large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11054*.
- Ying, Z.; Zheng, G.; Huang, Y.; Zhang, D.; Zhang, W.; Zou, Q.; Liu, A.; Liu, X.; and Tao, D. 2025c. Towards understanding the safety boundaries of deepseek models: Evaluation and findings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.15092*.
- Zhang, X.; Liu, H.; Xu, K.; Zhang, Q.; Liu, D.; Ahmed, B.; and Epps, J. 2024. When LLMs meets acoustic landmarks: An efficient approach to integrate speech into large language models for depression detection. arXiv:2403.12345.

Zhang, Y.; and Wei, Z. 2024. Boosting Jailbreak Attack with Momentum. arXiv:2405.01229.

Zhao, W. X.; Zhou, K.; Li, J.; Tang, T.; Zhang, X.; Chen, Y.; Shao, Y.; Dong, Z.; Wu, Y.; Zhang, J.; and Wei, F. 2023. A Survey of Large Language Models. arXiv:2303.18223.

Zhao, Y.; Zheng, W.; Cai, T.; Do, X. L.; Kawaguchi, K.; Goyal, A.; and Shieh, M. 2024. Accelerating Greedy Coordinate Gradient and General Prompt Optimization via Probe Sampling. arXiv:2403.01251.

Zheng, L.; Chiang, W.-L.; Sheng, Y.; Zhuang, S.; Wu, Z.; Zhuang, Y.; Lin, Z.; Li, Z.; Li, D.; Xing, E. P.; Zhang, H.; Gonzalez, J. E.; and Stoica, I. 2023. Judging LLM-as-a-Judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena. arXiv:2306.05685.

Zhu, D.; Yang, N.; Wang, L.; Song, Y.; Wu, W.; Wei, F.; and Li, S. 2023. PoSE: Efficient Context Window Extension of LLMs via Positional Skip-wise Training. arXiv:2309.10400.

Zou, A.; Wang, Z.; Carlini, N.; Nasr, M.; Kolter, J. Z.; and Fredrikson, M. 2023. Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models. arXiv:2307.15043.