

# AMULET: a Library for Assessing Interactions Among ML Defenses and Risks

Asim Waheed  
*University of Waterloo*  
 a7waheed@uwaterloo.ca

Vasisht Duddu  
*University of Waterloo*  
 vasisht.duddu@uwaterloo.ca

Rui Zhang  
*Zhejiang University*  
 zhangrui98@zju.edu.cn

Sebastian Szyller\*  
*Aalto University*  
 contact@sebszyller.com

N. Asokan  
*University of Waterloo*  
 asokan@acm.org

## Abstract

ML models are susceptible to risks to security, privacy, and fairness. Several defenses are designed to protect against their *intended* risks, but can inadvertently affect susceptibility to other unrelated risks, known as *unintended interactions*. Several jurisdictions are preparing ML regulatory frameworks that require ML practitioners to assess the susceptibility of ML models to different risks. A library for evaluating unintended interactions that can be used by (a) practitioners to evaluate unintended interactions at scale prior to model deployment and (b) researchers to design defenses which do not suffer from an unintended increase in unrelated risks. Ideally, such a library should be i) *comprehensive* by including representative attacks, defenses and metrics for different risks, ii) *extensible* to new modules due to its modular design, iii) *consistent* with a user-friendly API template for inputs and outputs, iv) *applicable* to evaluate previously unexplored unintended interactions. We present AMULET, a Python library that covers risks to security, privacy, and fairness, which satisfies all these requirements. AMULET can be used to evaluate unexplored unintended interactions, compare effectiveness between defenses or attacks, and include new attacks and defenses.

## 1 Introduction

Machine learning (ML) models are used in critical decisions, such as healthcare care, hiring, and loan approval. These deployments require key properties: *security*, *privacy*, and *fairness* [7, 11, 12, 28, 32, 37, 43]. However, ML models face *risks* that violate these properties [9, 11, 15]. *Attacks* exploit these risks [1, 7, 14, 16, 32, 36, 38, 42], while *defenses* aim to mitigate them [2, 3, 13, 25, 31, 33, 47, 49]. We call the interaction between a defense and its target risk an *intended interaction*. However, practitioners must address multiple risks at once; a defense for one risk can have *unintended interactions* with

others by inadvertently increasing or decreasing their susceptibility.

Regulators in several jurisdictions are drafting ML frameworks that require assessing model susceptibility to different risks [18, 19, 21, 24, 45]. Thus, we need an automatic way to assess susceptibility to both intended and unintended interactions. To this end, we propose a library that is: (i) *comprehensive* (representative attacks, defenses, and metrics across risks); (ii) *extensible* (easy addition of new modules); (iii) *consistent* (a simple API template for inputs and outputs); (iv) *applicable* (supports both intended and unintended interactions). Existing libraries satisfy some, but not all, of these requirements. They either focus on a single risk (e.g. [23, 39, 48, 51]), omit unintended interactions (e.g. [4, 6, 26, 28, 35, 37, 40]), or are difficult to extend with newer attacks or defenses (e.g. [26, 35, 39, 48, 51]). We provide more details in Section 3.

We present AMULET, a library that meets these requirements. It implements attacks, defenses, and metrics for security (evasion, poisoning, unauthorized model ownership), privacy (inference attacks), and fairness (discriminatory behavior). We envision AMULET being used by: i) *researchers* to explore new unintended interactions, study how variants of attacks, defenses, and metrics affect them, and design effective defenses, and, ii) *practitioners* to analyze trade-offs when deploying ML defenses and inform training decisions. We claim the following main contributions: we

1. present AMULET<sup>1</sup>, the *first* library to evaluate *both* intended and unintended interactions among ML defenses and risks,
2. show that AMULET spans diverse risks (*comprehensive*), has a modular design (*extensible*), and provides consistent API templates (Section 4),
3. demonstrate applicability by evaluating previously unexplored interactions and comparing the effectiveness of various defenses and attacks (Section 6).

\*Work done while at Intel Labs.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/ssg-research/amulet>

## 2 Background and Related Work

We introduce different risks to machine learning (ML) models (Section 2.1), the corresponding defenses (Section 2.2), and the interactions between them (Section 2.3).

### 2.1 Risks against Machine Learning

Following the systematization in previous work [11], we summarize the different risks in ML to security, privacy, and fairness. We start by summarizing different security risks (**S1**, **S2**, and **S3**):

**S1 Evasion** involves a class of attacks that attempt to fool a model  $\mathcal{M}$  to misclassify inputs. The most common way to force misclassification is by adding a small amount of noise to data records to obtain adversarial examples [32]. The adversarial noise added to the data records is computed by identifying the direction of higher loss for  $\mathcal{M}$  [32]. Such attacks are widely used as a benchmark for model robustness.

**S2 Data Poisoning** modifies  $\mathcal{M}$ 's decision boundary by adding malicious data records to the training data set. This forces  $\mathcal{M}$  to misclassify inputs, leading to a loss of utility. Backdoor attacks [16], a specific case of data poisoning, inject a backdoor (or *trigger*) into  $\mathcal{M}$  such that any input with that trigger is misclassified. They remain a central challenge because even a small fraction of poisoned data can significantly degrade model utility.

**S3 Unauthorized model ownership** refers to attacks where an adversary derives a surrogate model that mimics the functionality of  $\mathcal{M}$ . This may be an identical copy of  $\mathcal{M}$  or derived using model extraction attacks (training a local model using the output of  $\mathcal{M}$  [38]).

We now present risks to privacy (**P1**, **P2**, **P3**, and **P4**):

**P1 Membership Inference** attacks aim to infer whether a specific data record was part of  $\mathcal{M}$ 's training dataset ( $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$ ). They exploit the difference in  $\mathcal{M}$ 's predictions on data records sampled from  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  and data records sampled from elsewhere [7]. For example, training  $\mathcal{M}$  on cancer patient data could allow an adversary to infer whether a patient has cancer, even if this information is not explicitly included in training or the output of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**P2 Attribute Inference** where the goal is to infer the value of an attribute that is not included in the input or  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  [1]. When this attribute is sensitive (e.g., race or gender), it may be a privacy violation in the case where the data owner does not want to share this information. The inferred attributes can often be socially or legally sensitive.

**P3 Data Reconstruction** recovers the average data record of a particular class in  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  using the outputs of  $\mathcal{M}$  [14]. Some attacks may also recover individual data points [8]. In the case of generative models, the adversary can force the model to generate exact training data records [36].

**P4 Distribution Inference** infers properties of the distribution (e.g., ratio of men to women) from which training data were sampled from [42]. The adversary exploits the difference in  $\mathcal{M}$ 's behavior using shadow models trained on datasets with different distributions.

Finally, we present the risks to fairness (**F**):

**F Discriminatory Behavior** occurs when  $\mathcal{M}$  behaves differently between different demographic subgroups [13]. This could be due to inherent bias in  $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$  or due to bias introduced through training optimizations.

### 2.2 Machine Learning Defenses

For each of the risks, we present a corresponding defense. We first present defenses against security risks (**SD1**, **SD2**, **SD3**, and **SD4**):

**SD1 Adversarial Training** reduces the susceptibility against **S1** (evasion) by training  $\mathcal{M}$  with adversarial examples [32]. We minimize the maximum loss from the worst-case adversarial examples.

**SD2 Outlier Detection** works as a defense against **S2** (data poisoning). This works either by suppressing the effect of poisoned data points while training [25], by detecting and removing them from the training dataset [47], or by pruning  $\mathcal{M}$  after training [49].

**SD3 Fingerprinting** is a post-hoc defense against **S3** (model ownership verification) that extracts a unique fingerprint from the victim model and the suspect model to differentiate between them [33]. Fingerprints can be extracted from various model characteristics (for example, transferable adversarial examples [31], decision boundary information [33]).

**SD4 Watermarking** is another defense against **S3** that adds watermarks (marked data records) to the training dataset that can be later extracted to verify model ownership [3]. The watermarks are typically out-of-distribution samples which are memorized by  $\mathcal{M}$ , and can be easily extracted during verification [3].

To defend against risks to privacy (**PD1**):

**PD1 Differential privacy** (DP), specifically differentially private stochastic gradient descent (DPSGD) [2], is a defense against **P1** (Membership Inference) and **P3** (Data Reconstruction). DPSGD clips the gradients and adds an appropriate amount of noise to them during training s.t. model observables are indistinguishable with and without a single data record in the training dataset.

Currently, there are no defenses with theoretical guarantees against **P2** (Attribute Inference) and **P4** (Distribution Inference).

Finally, we present adversarial debiasing (**FD1**) as a defense for fairness risks:

**FD1 Adversarial Debiasing** ensures model behavior is similar across different demographic subgroups. The most common approach for this is to use a GAN-style network where the adversary acts as the discriminator to try and predict the demographic subgroup based on the differences in model behavior [30, 52].

### 2.3 Interactions among Defenses and Risks

Defenses are designed to protect against specific risks (as discussed in Section 2.2). However, a deployed model could be susceptible to various risks simultaneously. Hence, a practitioner must understand (a) the conflicts in combining defenses to protect against multiple risks [43], and (b) the interactions of the defense with other unrelated risks [11].

**Conflicts among Defenses.** Defenses can be combined to protect against multiple risks simultaneously [12]. However, defenses may conflict with each other and reduce the effectiveness of defenses or model utility after combination [43]. These can be viewed as unintended interactions among defenses.

**Unintended Interactions Among Defenses and Risks.** When a defense designed to protect against a specific risk is effective, it may increase or decrease susceptibility to other unrelated risks (aka “unintended interactions”) [11, 43]. For example, using adversarial training increases the susceptibility to other risks to privacy [41] and fairness [5]. Duddu et al. [11] systematically identified interactions among defenses and risks. They showed that overfitting and memorization are the underlying causes for unintended interactions. When a defense is effective, it affects overfitting and memorization, thus influencing the susceptibility to other risks that exploit overfitting and memorization. In addition, the factors influencing overfitting and memorization (e.g. size of the model and training dataset, distance to the decision boundary, etc.) also influence unintended interactions. However, they did not present a comprehensive evaluation of various unintended interactions.

In this work, we focus on unintended interactions between defenses and risks.

### 2.4 Other Libraries

ML-Doctor [28] is the closest related work that consolidates different privacy and security attacks such as model extraction, model inversion (data reconstruction), membership inference, and attribute inference attacks. Their goal is to evaluate the attacks against some benchmarks to help understand their relationship. In addition, they evaluate the impact of overfitting and data complexity on different privacy risks. Similarly, [35] present the ML Privacy Meter. However, it is limited to membership inference attacks and does not consider other interactions. Lastly, there are libraries for implementing and benchmarking different variants of DP in ML [48, 51]

There are separate frameworks that focus on the security of ML models. They implement methods to evaluate robustness threats against ML models by evaluating models against several evasion and poisoning attacks. These frameworks also implement adversarial training to help defend against these risks [10, 26, 37, 40]. The adversarial robustness toolbox also includes some risks to privacy [37]. TROJANZOO [39] is another security-focused library that primarily implements backdoor attacks.

Finally, for discriminatory behavior, there are libraries that implement methods for model explanations (e.g. Captum [23]) and algorithmic fairness [4, 6].

All these works design risks and defenses separately which do not allow us to easily evaluate their interactions.

## 3 Problem Statement

Our goal is to design a library to evaluate unintended and intended interactions among ML defenses and risks. However, there are many challenges that make this evaluation difficult. Different risks may use different datasets, threat models, and implementations. Prior work shows even evaluation strategies are often flawed and inconsistent [7]. Thus, there is a need to standardize these differences to allow for a thorough evaluation.

**Desiderata.** Ideally, a library must be:

- D1 comprehensive** by covering state-of-the-art attacks, defenses, and metrics for different risks;
- D2 consistent** by offering a user-friendly API;
- D3 extensible** by allowing easy addition of new modules;
- D4 applicable** to evaluate both intended and unintended interactions among ML defenses and risks.

**Limitations of prior work.** We surveyed and identified 11 libraries from prior work. These are summarized in Table 1 where we use ● if the requirement is satisfied, ◐ if the requirement is partially satisfied, and ○ if the requirement is not satisfied. We discuss how different libraries satisfy various requirements.

**D1 Comprehensive.** Among all the libraries, we find that 7 of them partially satisfy (◐) this requirement. These libraries are comprehensive with respect to specific categories of risks. The most comprehensive libraries for each category of risks are: ART [37] for security risks, ML-Doctor [28] for privacy risks, and Fairlearn [6] for fairness risks. However, none of these libraries includes modules for all three types of risk.

**D2 Consistent.** With the exception of DPMLBench [48], all the libraries listed are internally consistent (●). They provide easy-to-use APIs that in most cases can be plugged into any machine learning pipeline. Because these libraries often diverge widely in design, comparing risks across libraries is difficult.

Table 1: **Summary of prior work.** ●, ◐, and ○ denote whether the requirement is satisfied fully, partially, or not at all. We also denote which type of risks each library includes.

Library	D1	D2	D3	D4
CleverHans [40]	◐ (Robustness)	●	●	○
ART [37]	◐ (Security)	●	◐	○
DEEPSEC [26]	◐ (Security)	●	○	○
TrojanZoo [39]	○ (Poisoning)	●	○	○
ML-Doctor [28]	◐ (Privacy)	●	●	○
ML Privacy Meter [35]	◐ Privacy	●	○	○
DPMLBench [48]	○ (Mem. Inf.)	◐	○	○
Opacus [51]	○ (Diff. Priv.)	●	○	○
AIF360 [4]	◐ (Fairness)	●	●	○
Fairlearn [6]	◐ (Fairness)	●	●	○
Captum [23]	○ (Interpretability)	●	●	○

**D3 Extensible.** We consider a library extensible if users can easily contribute to the library to add new attacks, defenses, or metrics. If a library does not even contain a contributing guide, this requirement is not met. If it contains a minimal contribution guide, the requirement is partially satisfied (◐). If it contains a detailed contributing guide that includes code formatting instructions, the requirement is satisfied (●). We find that 5 of the libraries are extensible, while ART [37] partially satisfies (◐) the requirements.

**D4 Applicable.** While many of these libraries are comprehensive, extensible, and consistent, none of them is applicable to evaluate unintended interactions between different types of risk (○). In the best case, users can evaluate some intended interactions if the library provides both attack and defense modules.

## 4 Design of AMULET

We design AMULET to be modular, and target the following users: i) *researchers* who explore previously unexplored interactions, study how variants of attacks, defenses, metrics, and other factors influence the interactions, and design effective defenses to mitigate unintended and intended interactions; ii) *practitioners* who analyze the trade-offs in deploying ML defenses to specific to their domain, and regulatory environment.

We design AMULET to satisfy all four requirements discussed in Section 3.

**Design Rationale.** The core module in AMULET is a *risk*. For each risk, we implement i) attacks which exploit the risk, ii) defenses which protect against the risk, iii) metrics to evaluate the susceptibility to the risk. This modular structure is depicted in Figure 2.

We now discuss how we design AMULET to be comprehensive, extensible, and consistent.

## 4.1 Comprehensive

We consider eight risks to security, privacy, and fairness that cover six defenses and seven attacks. These risks are described in Section 2.1. The list of attacks and defenses is summarized in Table 2. The list of metrics is summarized in Table 3.

Table 2: Attacks and defenses currently implemented in Amulet.

Risk	Attack	Defense
S1	PGD [32]	PGD Adversarial Training [32]
S2	BadNets [16]	Outlier Removal
S3	Tramèr et al. [46]	Dataset Inference [33] Watermarking [3]
P1	LiRA [7]	DPSGD [2]
P2	Aalmoes et al. [1]	-
P4	Suri et al. [42]	-
P3	Fredrikson et al. [14]	DPSGD [2]
F	-	Adversarial Debiasing

Table 3: List of metrics implemented in Amulet.

Risk	Metric
S1: Evasion	Robust Accuracy
S2: Poisoning	Test Accuracy Poisoned Data Accuracy
S3: Unauthorized Model Ownership	Accuracy FPR FNR
P1: Membership Inference	AUC Score Balanced Accuracy TPR@1%FPR
P2: Attribute Inference	Balanced Accuracy AUC Score
P4: Distribution Inference	Attack Accuracy
P3: Data Reconstruction	MSE SSIM
F: Discriminatory Behavior	Demographic Parity True Positive Parity False Positive Parity Equalized Odds P-Rule

Currently, for each risk, we have selected the most popular attacks and defenses with a robust implementation that works across multiple datasets. Although this is a limited number of attacks and defenses, we focus on covering a breadth of risks instead of diving deep into a particular risk (which prior work has done). Our hope is that, given our additional goals of extensibility and consistency, it is easy to add an attack or defense by the open-source community.

## 4.2 Consistent

For consistency, the outputs of each attack module within a risk are the inputs to the metrics module. For a given risk, each attack or defense takes a model and other hyperparameters as input, except the poisoning attack (**S2**) which uses a dataset as input. The only requirement is that the model is a `PyTorch nn.Module`. This allows AMULET to be plugged into any PyTorch pipeline.

Furthermore, AMULET provides many helper functions to setup an end-to-end pipeline. These include data loading, model initialization, training, and evaluation. All helper functions, attacks, and defenses in AMULET have default values that give reasonable results, assuming a VGG model architecture and the CelebA or CIFAR10 dataset (described in Section 5).

Each attack, defense, and metric can be accessed using a consistent module layout. For attacks:

```
amulet.<risk>.attacks.<attack>
```

For defenses:

```
amulet.<risk>.defenses.<defense>
```

And for metrics:

```
amulet.<risk>.metrics.<metric>
```

Figure 1 shows some code samples, assuming some standard variables that exist in most ML pipelines. We take inspiration from Scikit-Learn where each algorithm is instantiated as an object to set the hyperparameters. Then it is run using a function call. Detailed examples are available on Github<sup>2</sup>

AMULET also provides an `AmuletDataset` class. Once a dataset is converted to `AmuletDataset`, it is compatible with any module in AMULET. Currently, all modules in AMULET support image-based (2 dimensional) and tabular (1 dimensional) datasets.

## 4.3 Extensible

AMULET includes a comprehensive contribution guide<sup>3</sup> that makes it easy to add new modules. We use `poetry`<sup>4</sup> to allow contributors to easily set up a development environment, `ruff`<sup>5</sup> and `pyright`<sup>6</sup> to enforce code quality. Contributors can easily run our `pre-commit`<sup>7</sup> hooks to ensure any submitted code is consistent with the existing code.

Our modular structure, shown in Figure 2, allows contributors to add a new module without affecting other modules.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/ssg-research/amulet/tree/main/examples>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/ssg-research/amulet/blob/main/docs/CONTRIBUTING.md>

<sup>4</sup><https://python-poetry.org/>

<sup>5</sup><https://docs.astral.sh/ruff/>

<sup>6</sup><https://microsoft.github.io/pyright/>

<sup>7</sup><https://pre-commit.com/>

Contributors should ensure that the output of an attack (or defense) module is consistent with the expected output for attacks (or defenses) in that risk. Similarly, contributors can add any metric calculation that accepts the outputs of an attack (or defense) within the risk. In future work, we plan to extend this functionality by using abstract base classes that further standardize the expected inputs and outputs for an attack, defense, or metric.

All helper functions in AMULET contain many configurable parameters to allow users to use AMULET in different ways as part of different ML pipelines. The aforementioned `AmuletDataset` class allows users to easily add new datasets for evaluation.

We hope that this extensibility and consistency of the API inspire the open-source community to further contribute to AMULET.

## 5 Experimental Setup

In addition to modules for risks, AMULET also defines modules for datasets, model configurations, and utility functions that set up an end-to-end pipeline.

**Datasets.** Users can download preprocessed datasets using the function `amulet.utils.load_data`. There are currently five datasets available in AMULET:

*FashionMNIST* consists of 60,000 training and 10,000 test grayscale images of size  $28 \times 28$ , each belonging to one of ten clothing categories [50].

*CIFAR10* consists of 60,000 images of  $32 \times 32$  color images belonging to one of ten classes, with 6,000 images per class. There are 50,000 training images and 10,000 test images.

*CENSUS* contains 46,447 records with 42 demographic and socioeconomic attributes from the 1994 US Census [22]. Sensitive fields include gender and race, while others describe education, occupation, and work hours. The classification task is to predict whether annual income exceeds \$50k, with 23,223 training and 23,224 test records.

*Labeled Faces in the Wild* (LFW) was originally developed for facial recognition. It includes 13,233 images (original size  $62 \times 47$ ) of public figures, combined with attributes such as gender, race, and age from the Columbia Imaging and Vision Laboratory (CAVE)<sup>8</sup>. These attributes convert LFW into a property inference task [34], with each image flattened to a vector of length 8,742.

*CelebFaces Attributes Dataset* (CelebA) is an image dataset containing 202,599 images and 40 attributes for each image [29]. It is often used as a computer vision benchmarking tool for face attribute recognition (e.g. is the person in the image smiling). AMULET uses CelebA for a binary classification task with the default attribute "Smiling". Users using

<sup>8</sup>[www.cs.columbia.edu/CAVE/databases/pubfig/download/lfw\\_attributes.txt](http://www.cs.columbia.edu/CAVE/databases/pubfig/download/lfw_attributes.txt)

---

```

1  from amulet.evasion.attacks import EvasionPGD
2  from amulet.utils import get_accuracy
3  # Instantiate amulet.EvasionPGD to run evasion
4  evasion = EvasionPGD(model, test_loader, device, batch_size=256, epsilon=0.01)
5
6  # Run evasion to get adversarial samples
7  adversarial_test_loader = evasion.attack()
8
9  # Adversarial accuracy
10 adv_accuracy = get_accuracy(model, adversarial_test_loader, device)
11
12 # To run Adversarial Training
13 from amulet.evasion.defenses import AdversarialTrainingPGD
14 adv_training = AdversarialTrainingPGD(
15     model,
16     loss_function,
17     optimizer,
18     train_loader,
19     device,
20     epochs,
21     epsilon=0.01,
22 )
23 defened_model = adv_training.train_robust()
24 adv_accuracy_defened = get_accuracy(defened_model, adversarial_test_loader, device)
25
26 # To run Model Extraction
27 from amulet.unauth_model_ownership.attacks import ModelExtraction
28 from amulet.unauth_model_ownership.metrics import evaluate_extraction
29 model_extraction = ModelExtraction(
30     target_model,
31     attack_model,
32     optimizer,
33     criterion,
34     adversary_training_data,
35     device,
36     epochs,
37 )
38 attack_model = model_extraction.attack()
39 evaluation_results = evaluate_extraction(target_model, attack_model, test_loader, device)

```

---

Figure 1: Evasion, adversarial training, and model extraction using the Amulet API, assuming the target model, optimizer, and loss criterion are available. Each attack, or defense, in a risk is instantiated as an object. Then, for attacks, simply call the `attack()` function to run the attack. For defenses, it will be one of `train_robust()`, `train_fair()`, or `train_private()`, based on the type of defense. Note: the `attack_model` on line 31 is an untrained model.

AMULET can easily change this attribute by changing a parameter.

**Model Configuration.** AMULET also provides some basic models for quick testing, with configurable model sizes, input and output dimensions, and the ability to include or remove batch normalization where applicable:

- VGG [27]: includes VGG11, VGG13, VGG16, and VGG19.
- ResNet [17]: includes ResNet18, ResNet34, ResNet50, and ResNet101
- LinearNet: a simple fully connected neural network with configurable layer sizes, similar to SciKit-Learn<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup>[https://scikit-learn.org/stable/api/sklearn.neural\\_network.html](https://scikit-learn.org/stable/api/sklearn.neural_network.html)

**Pipeline Modules.** We implement the following algorithms in AMULET:

- **S1 (Evasion) & SD1 (Adversarial Training):** We use the PGD algorithm from the CleverHans library<sup>10</sup> [32] to generate adversarial examples for both evasion attacks and adversarial training.
- **S2 (Poisoning):** We adopt BadNets from its original implementation<sup>11</sup> [16], which injects a simple trigger at the edge of every input to induce misclassification.
- **S3 (Unauthorized Model Ownership):** We implement model extraction using ML-Doctor [28], which trains a surrogate model to minimize the mean squared error

<sup>10</sup><https://github.com/cleverhans-lab/cleverhans>

<sup>11</sup><https://github.com/Billy1900/BadNet>




Figure 2: **Overview of AMULET’s modular design:** Top level modules are categorized into different properties (in blue): security, privacy, and fairness. Under each property, we include different risks which violate them (in orange). Under each risk, we include attacks which exploit the risk (in red), defenses to protect against the risk (in green), and metrics to evaluate the susceptibility to the risk (in yellow).

- (MSE) between its output logits and those of the target model.
- **P1** (Membership Inference): We use LiRA [7], which estimates membership by comparing the model’s behavior on an input to that of shadow models trained with and without the input, using a likelihood ratio test.
- **P2** (Attribute Inference): We implement the attack described in [1], which trains an MLP classifier on the target model’s outputs to infer sensitive attributes of the input data.
- **P3** (Data Reconstruction): We use the implementation from ML-Doctor [28], which applies gradient descent to reconstruct an input that maximizes the target model’s confidence for a given class.
- **SD2** (Outlier Removal): We implement outlier removal by deleting records with the highest Shapley values, following the data valuation approach in [20].
- **SD3** (Fingerprinting): We implement the dataset inference method from [33]<sup>12</sup>, which determines whether a specific dataset was used to train a model by comparing adversarial vulnerability fingerprints between models.

- **SD4** (Watermarking): We use the backdoor-based neural network watermarking method from [3]<sup>13</sup>, which embeds a unique pattern into the model’s behavior via a backdoor trigger.
- **PD1** (Differential Privacy): We incorporate differentially private stochastic gradient descent using Opacus [51]<sup>14</sup>, which ensures formal privacy guarantees during model training.

## 6 Evaluating Applicability of AMULET

We have shown that AMULET satisfies **D1**, **D3**, **D2**, and now demonstrate the **D4** applicability of AMULET. First, we show the baseline results for the risks implemented in AMULET for the CelebA dataset. These baselines allow us to compare the difference in metrics before and after a defense is implemented and may be used as a reference. We use these baselines to tune the default hyperparameters in the library. We chose the CelebA dataset for our baselines, as it is an image-based dataset that also contains sensitive attributes. Then, we show three examples of unexplored unintended interactions.

<sup>12</sup><https://github.com/cleverhans-lab/dataset-inference/tree/main>

<sup>13</sup><https://github.com/adiyoss/WatermarkNN>

<sup>14</sup>[https://opacus.ai/api/privacy\\_engine.html](https://opacus.ai/api/privacy_engine.html)

Table 4: Evaluation of risks implemented in Amulet using the CelebA dataset. The test accuracy, robust accuracy, attack accuracy, and fixed accuracy are denoted as  $Acc_{te}$ ,  $Acc_{rob}$ ,  $Acc_{att}$ ,  $Acc_{fix}$  respectively. Similarly,  $Acc_{pois}$  is the accuracy on the poisoned dataset.  $\mathcal{M}_{std}$  is the target model,  $\mathcal{M}_{pois}$  is the poisoned model, and  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  is the stolen model after model extraction. \*Membership Inference uses ResNet-18 architecture that is overfit on purpose.

Attack	Model Architecture	VGG11	VGG13	VGG16	VGG19
	$Acc_{te}$	91.21 ± 0.05	91.46 ± 0.04	91.38 ± 0.03	91.41 ± 0.03
<b>S1</b> (Evasion)	$Acc_{rob}$	10.08 ± 0.13	8.60 ± 0.05	8.65 ± 0.02	8.67 ± 0.04
<b>S2</b> (Poisoning)	$Acc_{pois}$ ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	8.13 ± 0.30	8.27 ± 0.34	8.17 ± 0.19	7.57 ± 0.31
	$Acc_{te}$ ( $\mathcal{M}_{pois}$ )	91.16 ± 0.03	91.48 ± 0.04	91.39 ± 0.03	91.37 ± 0.08
	$Acc_{pois}$ ( $\mathcal{M}_{pois}$ )	95.70 ± 0.21	96.70 ± 0.10	96.62 ± 0.18	96.75 ± 0.18
<b>S3</b> (Unauthorized Model Ownership)	$Acc_{te}$ ( $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$ )	91.02 ± 0.09	91.32 ± 0.07	91.42 ± 0.08	91.39 ± 0.06
	$Fid$ ( $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$ )	94.64 ± 0.16	94.75 ± 0.09	94.74 ± 0.11	94.84 ± 0.08
	$Fid_{corr}$ ( $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$ )	93.14 ± 0.06	93.49 ± 0.03	93.51 ± 0.02	93.41 ± 0.04
<b>P1</b> (Membership Inference)*	$Acc_{tr}$	94.20 ± 1.33	-	-	-
	$Acc_{te}$	76.81 ± 0.48	-	-	-
	Offline $Acc_{fix}$	50.41 ± 00.13	-	-	-
	Offline AUC	0.49 ± 0.00	-	-	-
	Offline TPR@1%FPR	0.83 ± 0.11	-	-	-
	Online $Acc_{fix}$	60.67 ± 00.70	-	-	-
	Online AUC	0.64 ± 0.01	-	-	-
Online TPR@1%FPR	2.70 ± 0.25	-	-	-	
<b>P2</b> (Attribute Inference)	$Acc_{att}$	57.17 ± 00.15	57.12 ± 00.12	57.27 ± 00.11	56.90 ± 00.13
	AUC	0.59 ± 0.00	0.59 ± 0.00	0.59 ± 0.00	0.58 ± 0.00
<b>P3</b> (Data Reconstruction)	$MSE_{avg}$	0.20 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.000
	$MSE_0$	0.19 ± 0.00	0.19 ± 0.00	0.19 ± 0.00	0.19 ± 0.00
	$MSE_1$	0.20 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.00	0.20 ± 0.00

## 6.1 Baseline Results

Using the setup in Section 5, we run each experiment ten times and report the mean and standard error. We train VGG models for 100 epochs with cross-entropy loss and the Adam optimizer, and evaluate each algorithm using AMULET’s metrics, comparing to the original paper when possible. Baseline results are shown in Table 4. Overall, our reproductions closely match prior work, with exceptions noted below.

**S1 (Evasion).** Prior work evaluates the PGD algorithm on CIFAR10 using an epsilon of 8 (with the data range being 0 – 255). They report that the robust accuracy ( $Acc_{rob}$ ) is between 0.8 – 3.5% for a ResNet model (Figure 6 in Appendix C) [32]. We reproduced the results using AMULET with a comparable model (ResNet34) and the same perturbation budget ( $\epsilon = 0.03$ ), obtaining a robust accuracy ( $Acc_{rob}$ ) of 3.8%. Our results using CelebA show a robust accuracy between 8.6% and 10%, which makes it less effective than the original work. We suspect this is due to the CelebA dataset being much larger in size (60,000 images vs.  $\approx 202,000$  images), as larger datasets result in a more robust model.

**S2 (Poisoning).** The original work only tested the attack on the MNIST and traffic signs datasets [16]. Although MNIST is no longer commonly used for algorithm evaluation — since achieving 99% accuracy is relatively straightforward — we reproduced the results in MNIST using a simple two-layer CNN, obtaining a poisoning accuracy ( $Acc_{pois}$ ) of 99%. Our

results show that using CelebA, the poisoned model achieves a 97%  $Acc_{pois}$ , while the clean model ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ ) only achieves a 8%  $Acc_{pois}$ . The low accuracy of the poisoned dataset on  $\mathcal{M}_{std}$  suggests that the dataset is correctly poisoned. The extremely high accuracy of the poisoned dataset on  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  further suggests that the model learned the backdoor. Given the high  $Acc_{pois}$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{pois}$ , the attack is effective.

**S3 (Unauthorized Model Ownership).** Previous work evaluates model extraction using CelebA and VGG19, using an experimental setup similar to ours [28]. However, they combine three attributes to form an 8-class classification problem instead of the binary classification problem we use. The best fidelity they achieve between  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{std}$  using VGG19 and CelebA is  $\approx 81\%$ . The model extraction attack in AMULET outperforms this by training a surrogate model with a fidelity of  $\approx 94\%$  for CelebA. We suspect that this is because the target models in the prior work are more overfit than ours (Table 2 in [28]). In addition, we also report the correct fidelity ( $Fid_{corr}$ ) between both models.  $Fid_{corr}$  is fidelity conditioned on correctness, that is, when models agree, how often are they also correct? Although this metric has not been reported in previous work, we include it in AMULET for a more comprehensive evaluation suite.

**P1 (Membership Inference).** AMULET implements the true positive rate (TPR) at a fixed false positive rate (FPR) of 1%, as recommended in prior work [7]. Furthermore, we also

include the *balanced accuracy* metric which finds the best accuracy given the thresholds from the ROC curve. We also report the AUC score. Prior work trained a ResNet model on CIFAR10 as the target model. For the attack, they used 256 shadow models and achieved a TPR of 2.2% at 0.001% FPR and 8.4% TPR at 0.1% FPR, and a balanced accuracy of 63.8% [7]. To achieve results close to the original work, we had to use a ResNet-18 model and force the model to overfit (as noted by the train and test accuracies in Table 4). A well-trained generalized model using the entire CelebA dataset is not susceptible to this membership-inference attack.

**P2 (Attribute Inference).** Recall that the goal of attribute inference is to infer the value of an attribute that is not otherwise available. This is measured using the attack accuracy ( $Acc_{att}$ ) and the AUC score. Although prior work did not evaluate the algorithm on the CelebA dataset, we can look at the range of  $Acc_{te}$  across their results. In particular, the maximum and minimum  $Acc_{att}$  the authors achieved was 62% on the Compass dataset and 53%  $Acc_{att}$  on the MEPS dataset [1], the minimum. We achieve  $\approx 57\%$  accuracy for the CelebA dataset (Table 4). Furthermore, during the preliminary tests we achieved an accuracy of  $\approx 65\%$  (Race) and  $\approx 59\%$  (Sex) on the Census dataset, which is in line with the accuracy of the original work of  $\approx 56\%$  (Race) and  $\approx 58\%$  (Sex) on the same dataset. Given the prior results and our preliminary testing, we believe these results to be reasonable.

**P3 (Data Reconstruction).** Prior work applied the same algorithm as AMULET using a similar model architecture on the CelebA dataset (with 8 classes instead of 2 as mentioned under S3 results). However, they achieved a lower MSE ( $\approx 0.1$  vs.  $\approx 0.2$ ) than our reproduction [28]. Since the attack finds an *average* data point for a particular class, having more granular classes could lead to a better attack and a lower MSE.

## 6.2 Unintended Interaction

Next, we use of AMULET to identify the nature of different unexplored unintended interactions. We focus on i) *unexplored interactions* and, ii) *partially explored interactions* where the nature of the interaction is known, but the underlying factors that influence it are unclear. We summarize both unexplored and partially explored interactions in Table 5. To evaluate D4, we give three examples of unintended interactions:

- **SD1** (Adversarial Training) and **P2** (Attribute Inference).
- **SD1** (Adversarial Training) and **S3** (Unauthorized Model Ownership).
- **SD2** (Outlier Removal) and **S3** (Unauthorized Model Ownership).

**SD1 (Adversarial Training) and P2 (Attribute Inference).** We first use the Census and LFW datasets to evaluate how adversarial training (**SD1**) affects attribute inference (**P2**) and summarize the results in Table 6. For this experiment, we

Table 5: Summary of the unexplored/partially explored unintended interactions from SoK [11].

Defense	Risk
<b>Unexplored Interactions:</b>	
<b>SD1</b> (Adversarial Training)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P2</b> (Attribute Inference)
<b>SD2</b> (Outlier Removal)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P3</b> (Data Reconstruction)
<b>PD1</b> (Differential Privacy)	$\rightarrow$ <b>S3</b> (Unauthorized Model Ownership)
<b>FD1</b> (Group Fairness)	$\rightarrow$ <b>S3</b> (Unauthorized Model Ownership)
<b>SD3</b> (Fingerprinting)	$\rightarrow$ <b>S2</b> (Poisoning)
<b>SD3</b> (Fingerprinting)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P3</b> (Data Reconstruction)
<b>SD3</b> (Fingerprinting)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P2</b> (Attribute Inference)
<b>SD3</b> (Fingerprinting)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P4</b> (Distribution Inference)
<b>SD3</b> (Fingerprinting)	$\rightarrow$ <b>F</b> (Discriminatory Behaviour)
<b>Partially Explored Interactions:</b>	
<b>SD1</b> (Adversarial Training)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P4</b> (Distribution Inference)
<b>SD1</b> (Adversarial Training)	$\rightarrow$ <b>S3</b> (Unauthorized Model Ownership)
<b>PD1</b> (Differential Privacy)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P2</b> (Attribute Inference)
<b>FD1</b> (Group Fairness)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P2</b> (Attribute Inference)
<b>FD1</b> (Group Fairness)	$\rightarrow$ <b>P4</b> (Distribution Inference)

reserve 50% of the training data for the adversary running the attribute inference attack, which impacts the performance and robustness of  $\mathcal{M}_{std}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ .

Looking first at CENSUS, we see that the attack accuracy for the race attribute ( $Acc_{att}^{Race}$ ) starts at  $\approx 58\%$  for the baseline and increases to  $\approx 59\%$  for  $\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$ , and then stays constant at around 60%. The AUC for Race shows a similar trend. Interestingly, we note the opposite trend when we look at the same metrics for the Sex attribute. It starts at an  $Acc_{att}$  of  $\approx 65\%$  for the baseline without adversarial training, but increases very slowly to  $\approx 67\%$  at  $\epsilon_{rob} = 0.1$ . The AUC for Sex follows the same trend. However, in both cases, the difference in values is just  $\approx 2$  p.p. Hence, we conclude that the effect is nearly negligible in the case of CENSUS.

For LFW, the change in  $Acc_{att}$  is more significant. The baseline  $Acc_{att}$  is  $\approx 66\%$  and increases to  $\approx 72\%$  for a  $\epsilon_{rob} = 0.06$ , and AUC follows a similar trend. Similarly to the results for CENSUS, the metrics for the attribute Sex have the opposite trend to the metrics for the attribute Race. However, it should be noted that the adversarial training in LFW was not as effective as it was for CENSUS. At  $\epsilon_{rob} = 0.06$ ,  $Acc_{rob}$  for the adversarially trained model ( $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ ) is only  $\approx 33\%$ . Although  $Acc_{rob}$  for  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  is still higher than  $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ , it would be a stretch to call this a robust model.

Based on these experiments, we would conclude that **SD1** does not have a significant impact on **P2**.

**SD1 (Adversarial Training) and S3 (Unauthorized Model Ownership).** We evaluate how adversarial training (**SD1**) impacts the performance of model extraction attacks (**S3**), summarized in Table 7. In this setting, the adversary extracts  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  from a robustly trained model  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ . We report results across four datasets and observe that the interaction between the two defenses varies by domain and robustness level.

On CENSUS and FMNIST, adversarial training has minimal effect on extractability. Across increasing robustness levels ( $\epsilon_{rob}$  from 0.01 to 0.10), the surrogate model  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  maintains

Table 6: Interaction between **SD1** Adversarial Training and **P2** Attribute Inference.  $Acc_{te}$  is the accuracy on test dataset,  $Acc_{rob}$  is the test accuracy on dataset with adversarial examples for model with ( $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ ) and without **SD1** ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ ).  $Acc_{att}$  and **AUC** are the attack accuracy and AUC score on correctly inferring Race or Sex attribute. We do not observe a significant and consistent change in susceptibility to **P2** on training a model with **SD1**.

CENSUS							
	$Acc_{te}$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{std})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$Acc_{att}(\text{Race})$	$AUC(\text{Race})$	$Acc_{att}(\text{Sex})$	$AUC(\text{Sex})$
Baseline ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	$81.99 \pm 0.57$	-	-	$58.58 \pm 0.88$	$0.61 \pm 0.01$	$65.06 \pm 1.21$	$0.69 \pm 0.01$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$	$82.53 \pm 0.44$	$73.87 \pm 1.18$	$81.15 \pm 0.68$	$59.64 \pm 0.53$	$0.62 \pm 0.01$	$65.88 \pm 0.80$	$0.70 \pm 0.01$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.03$	$83.00 \pm 0.26$	$44.25 \pm 4.27$	$80.10 \pm 0.79$	$60.23 \pm 0.63$	$0.63 \pm 0.01$	$66.23 \pm 0.58$	$0.70 \pm 0.00$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.06$	$83.40 \pm 0.36$	$22.70 \pm 1.95$	$80.03 \pm 0.64$	$60.28 \pm 0.31$	$0.63 \pm 0.00$	$66.78 \pm 1.09$	$0.71 \pm 0.01$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.1$	$83.70 \pm 0.24$	$20.89 \pm 0.88$	$76.03 \pm 2.58$	$60.60 \pm 0.59$	$0.64 \pm 0.01$	$67.44 \pm 1.07$	$0.72 \pm 0.01$
LFW							
	$Acc_{te}$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{std})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$Acc_{att}(\text{Race})$	$AUC(\text{Race})$	$Acc_{att}(\text{Sex})$	$AUC(\text{Sex})$
Baseline ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	$82.84 \pm 0.56$	-	-	$66.80 \pm 4.07$	$0.73 \pm 0.05$	$76.59 \pm 1.00$	$0.84 \pm 0.01$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$	$81.36 \pm 0.67$	$54.31 \pm 1.48$	$75.09 \pm 0.95$	$68.41 \pm 6.43$	$0.74 \pm 0.08$	$76.16 \pm 0.74$	$0.84 \pm 0.01$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.03$	$79.57 \pm 0.59$	$18.66 \pm 0.48$	$50.22 \pm 2.39$	$68.64 \pm 3.65$	$0.76 \pm 0.05$	$75.22 \pm 0.91$	$0.82 \pm 0.02$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.06$	$78.47 \pm 0.66$	$17.20 \pm 0.55$	$33.28 \pm 2.58$	$72.37 \pm 2.79$	$0.79 \pm 0.04$	$75.06 \pm 1.30$	$0.82 \pm 0.01$
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.1$	$81.29 \pm 0.92$	$17.15 \pm 0.57$	$19.25 \pm 0.85$	$67.79 \pm 5.38$	$0.74 \pm 0.05$	$75.78 \pm 1.42$	$0.82 \pm 0.01$

high fidelity ( $Fid$ ) to the robust model  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ , achieving up to  $\approx 98\%$  and  $\approx 96\%$ , respectively. Correct fidelity ( $Fid_{cor}$ ) remains stable, around 84% for CENSUS, and decreases from  $\approx 88\%$  to  $\approx 82\%$  from FMNIST. Since  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  retains high test accuracy ( $Acc_{te}$ ),  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  effectively approximates both its behavior and correctness.

In contrast, on more complex datasets like LFW and CIFAR, we observe a different pattern. Fidelity ( $Fid$ ) continues to increase with stronger adversarial training, showing that  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  is more closely tracking  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ 's predictions. However,  $Fid_{cor}$  drops substantially, which is expected because  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  itself becomes less accurate at higher  $\epsilon_{rob}$  values. For instance, on CIFAR, at  $\epsilon_{rob} = 0.10$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  has  $Acc_{te} \approx 62\%$  and  $Acc_{rob} \approx 19\%$ , while  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  achieves only  $\approx 61\%$  test accuracy and a  $Fid$  of  $\approx 87\%$  (the highest on CIFAR). This indicates that  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  faithfully replicates a model that is increasingly incorrect.

Taken together, these findings suggest that adversarial training can, in fact, *increase* susceptibility to model extraction, as it leads to more consistent and predictable decision boundaries that are easier to imitate. While adversarial training reduces test accuracy and increases robustness of the model itself, it appears to also enhance the extractability of the model's behavior. More robust training may thus inadvertently aid an attacker in constructing high-fidelity surrogates. However, this requires more research with better-tuned adversarial training to confirm this trend more conclusively.

**SD2 (Outlier Removal) and S3 (Unauthorized Model Ownership).** Finally, we evaluate the interaction between outlier removal (**SD2**) and unauthorized model ownership (**S3**). As the percentage of outliers removed increases, the test accuracy of the defended model ( $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ ) decreases. This is expected since **SD2** uses Shapley values to identify data records with the highest influence, and removing them can degrade accu-




Figure 3: Comparison of  $Acc_{te}$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  and  $Fid$  between  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  for the given percentage of outliers removed from  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ .  $Acc_{te}$  shows a clear downward trend, while fidelity is not affected. The colors differentiate the dataset, while the dotted lines represent  $Acc_{te}$  and the solid lines represent  $Fid$ .

Table 7: Interaction between **SD1** Adversarial Training and **S3** Unauthorized Model Ownership.  $Acc_{te}$  is the accuracy on test dataset,  $Acc_{rob}$  is the test accuracy on dataset with adversarial examples for model with ( $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ ) and without **SD1** ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ ).  $Fid$  and  $Fid_{cor}$  is the fidelity and correct fidelity between  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  and the stolen model ( $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$ ).

CENSUS						
	$Acc_{te}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{std})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{cor}$
Baseline ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	81.95 ± 0.62	-	-	-	-	-
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$	82.27 ± 1.59	73.25 ± 1.15	81.43 ± 1.84	82.74 ± 1.69	95.30 ± 0.98	84.10 ± 1.47
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.03$	82.88 ± 0.74	42.40 ± 5.58	80.33 ± 1.69	83.30 ± 0.62	96.44 ± 0.74	84.31 ± 0.51
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.05$	83.02 ± 0.89	26.02 ± 4.46	78.99 ± 2.91	83.46 ± 0.88	96.95 ± 0.60	84.28 ± 0.76
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.10$	84.06 ± 0.15	20.32 ± 1.65	79.23 ± 2.45	84.38 ± 0.15	98.34 ± 0.38	84.79 ± 0.21
FMNIST						
	$Acc_{te}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{std})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{cor}$
Baseline ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	85.67 ± 0.31	-	-	-	-	-
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$	84.81 ± 0.69	77.38 ± 0.73	80.63 ± 0.69	84.45 ± 0.60	92.42 ± 0.45	88.27 ± 0.59
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.03$	84.92 ± 0.43	42.54 ± 1.31	74.59 ± 0.72	84.32 ± 0.37	94.76 ± 0.34	87.07 ± 0.36
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.05$	83.86 ± 0.58	19.59 ± 0.91	69.08 ± 1.46	83.26 ± 0.43	95.78 ± 0.23	85.39 ± 0.38
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.10$	80.58 ± 0.63	7.97 ± 0.33	58.55 ± 2.10	80.30 ± 0.51	96.16 ± 0.37	82.15 ± 0.46
LFW						
	$Acc_{te}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{std})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{cor}$
Baseline ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	82.89 ± 0.63	-	-	-	-	-
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$	81.04 ± 1.22	52.51 ± 1.79	74.80 ± 2.48	78.73 ± 3.48	87.91 ± 4.13	84.00 ± 1.34
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.03$	77.83 ± 1.62	18.03 ± 0.65	55.08 ± 9.00	77.84 ± 1.91	89.11 ± 3.48	81.31 ± 2.61
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.05$	76.62 ± 2.22	17.15 ± 0.63	45.78 ± 12.10	76.83 ± 2.73	90.73 ± 2.79	79.54 ± 3.36
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.10$	65.99 ± 0.61	17.12 ± 0.63	59.68 ± 13.60	65.97 ± 0.67	99.74 ± 0.30	66.02 ± 0.68
CIFAR						
	$Acc_{te}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{std})$	$Acc_{rob}(\mathcal{M}_{def})$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{cor}$
Baseline ( $\mathcal{M}_{std}$ )	83.30 ± 1.93	-	-	-	-	-
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.01$	80.85 ± 0.26	23.82 ± 1.82	66.82 ± 0.57	79.30 ± 0.77	83.94 ± 0.85	88.14 ± 0.42
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.03$	70.69 ± 0.44	9.12 ± 0.76	38.85 ± 0.84	70.31 ± 1.21	79.17 ± 0.73	79.82 ± 0.78
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.05$	66.31 ± 0.78	7.96 ± 1.23	26.86 ± 0.58	66.18 ± 0.80	78.94 ± 1.09	74.78 ± 0.76
$\epsilon_{rob} = 0.10$	62.65 ± 15.41	5.20 ± 1.66	19.29 ± 7.96	61.43 ± 15.63	86.77 ± 1.26	66.62 ± 17.33

racy [20]. In the case of CENSUS, for example,  $Acc_{te}$  drops from  $\approx 84.6\%$  (baseline) to  $\approx 81\%$  (10% outliers removed), all the way to  $\approx 77\%$  (40% outliers removed). Analyzing the effect this has on unauthorized model ownership, Figure 3 shows that while  $Acc_{te}$  of  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  drops significantly for all datasets, the fidelity of  $\mathcal{M}_{stol}$  stays constant (in the case of CENSUS) or drops slightly (in the case of CIFAR and FMNIST).

This suggests that outlier removal does not affect unauthorized model ownership. In Figure 4, we compare  $Fid_{corr}$  with  $Acc_{te}$  — they both trend downward. For CIFAR, removing 10% of the outliers results in a  $\geq 7.5$  p.p. drop in both  $Acc_{te}$  and  $Fid_{corr}$ . While the general agreement between  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{std}$  is not affected by the removal of the outliers, the agreement on the data records that both models classify correctly is. We attribute this to the drop in  $Acc_{te}$ . We conclude that **SD2** does not affect **S3**.

## 7 Discussion

**Extending AMULET to modern architectures.** Most modules in AMULET assume simple model architectures that are

now obsolete in favor of transformer-based models or diffusion models. We did this because most ML security research up until recently has used these old architectures to evaluate algorithms. Since AMULET uses implementations from popular ML security research papers, it is not trivial to adapt every algorithm to work with more modern architectures. Although it is easy to plug these modern architectures into AMULET, it is questionable whether the same algorithm would perform as expected. Thus, more research would be required to understand how applicable older algorithms are to more modern architectures.

**Adding more attacks and defenses.** As explained in Section 4, while AMULET covers a wide range of risks, the majority of the modules in AMULET are not state-of-the-art attacks or defenses for a particular risk. While selecting the initial algorithms to include in AMULET, we prioritized algorithms with open-source implementations that have been analyzed by multiple peer-reviewed articles. Furthermore, each algorithm that we implemented required rigorous testing, as our goal was to use the algorithm with a variety of datasets and models. Thus, it would be helpful if the open source community could add more attacks and defenses to AMULET to make it more

Table 8: Interaction between **SD2** Outlier Removal and **S3** Unauthorized Model Ownership.

	$\mathcal{M}_{std}$	$\mathcal{M}_{def}$ (% of outliers removed followed by retraining)			
		10%	20%	30%	40%
<b>CENSUS</b>					
$Acc_{te}$	84.60 ± 0.16	81.80 ± 0.30	80.73 ± 0.52	79.43 ± 0.45	77.61 ± 0.39
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	84.56 ± 0.14	81.71 ± 0.37	80.63 ± 0.61	79.41 ± 0.43	77.55 ± 0.47
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	99.12 ± 0.08	98.88 ± 0.24	99.07 ± 0.14	99.17 ± 0.19	99.00 ± 0.19
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{corr}$	84.14 ± 0.17	81.19 ± 0.36	80.22 ± 0.62	79.00 ± 0.43	77.08 ± 0.37
<b>LFW</b>					
$Acc_{te}$	81.40 ± 0.83	80.78 ± 1.19	79.41 ± 1.65	77.61 ± 2.78	78.25 ± 0.29
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	80.96 ± 0.48	80.08 ± 1.16	78.77 ± 2.24	78.03 ± 2.53	76.09 ± 1.04
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	94.55 ± 0.67	94.31 ± 1.53	93.35 ± 1.56	95.47 ± 0.59	93.46 ± 2.37
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{corr}$	78.46 ± 0.38	77.58 ± 0.66	75.76 ± 1.96	75.56 ± 2.56	73.90 ± 1.64
<b>FMNIST</b>					
$Acc_{te}$	83.51 ± 0.55	79.19 ± 0.58	78.40 ± 1.09	75.39 ± 1.22	75.22 ± 1.27
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	82.74 ± 0.66	79.61 ± 0.67	79.28 ± 0.45	74.79 ± 1.46	75.65 ± 1.58
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	92.89 ± 0.45	90.61 ± 0.34	89.68 ± 0.56	89.72 ± 0.59	88.75 ± 0.85
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{corr}$	80.27 ± 0.58	75.65 ± 0.70	74.66 ± 0.90	71.03 ± 1.48	70.91 ± 1.62
<b>CIFAR</b>					
$Acc_{te}$	83.65 ± 0.38	75.35 ± 0.33	73.86 ± 1.32	71.86 ± 0.67	70.50 ± 1.01
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Acc_{te}$	82.03 ± 0.56	75.81 ± 0.48	74.26 ± 1.32	72.13 ± 1.11	71.62 ± 1.25
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid$	86.52 ± 0.32	84.66 ± 0.76	84.14 ± 1.37	83.83 ± 0.49	83.61 ± 0.89
$\mathcal{M}_{stol}: Fid_{corr}$	77.73 ± 0.54	70.17 ± 0.41	68.54 ± 1.68	66.49 ± 0.92	65.43 ± 1.26




Figure 4: Comparison of  $Acc_{te}$  and  $Fid_{corr}$  for the given percentage of outliers removed from  $\mathcal{M}_{def}$ . Both measures follow a similar downward trend. The colors differentiate the dataset, while the dotted lines represent  $Acc_{te}$  and the solid lines represent  $Fid_{corr}$ . Error bars omitted for readability.

useful to study unintended interactions.

**Studying conflicting defenses.** While AMULET is good at studying the effect of one defense on another unrelated risk, it is still difficult to study how two defenses interact with each other. For example, both adversarial training and DP-SGD are applied during training, such case is not implemented by AMULET. This is important to study for real-world deployments where a user may need to defend their models against multiple risks at the same time [43].

For example, the effect of **SD1** on fingerprinting (**SD3**) is probably worth studying. Depending on the techniques used, many fingerprinting techniques exploit decision boundaries [33, 44] and transferrable adversarial examples [31, 43] in some way to verify model ownership. Since **SD1** affects the decision boundary and adversarial examples of the model, it is questionable whether **SD3** will work alongside **SD1**.

## References

- [1] Jan Aalmoes, Vasisht Duddu, and Antoine Boutet. On the alignment of group fairness with attribute privacy. In *WISE (2)*, pages 333–348, 2024.
- [2] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H. Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS '16*, page 308–318, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [3] Yossi Adi, Carsten Baum, Moustapha Cisse, Benny Pinkas, and Joseph Keshet. Turning your weakness into a strength: Watermarking deep neural networks by back-dooring. In *27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 18)*, pages 1615–1631, Baltimore, MD, August 2018. USENIX Association.

- [4] Rachel KE Bellamy et al. Ai fairness 360: An extensible toolkit for detecting, understanding, and mitigating unwanted algorithmic bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01943*, 2018.
- [5] Philipp Benz, Chaoning Zhang, Adil Karjauv, and In So Kweon. Robustness may be at odds with fairness: An empirical study on class-wise accuracy. In Luca Bertinetto, João F. Henriques, Samuel Albanie, Michela Paganini, and Gül Varol, editors, *NeurIPS 2020 Workshop on Pre-registration in Machine Learning*, volume 148 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 325–342. PMLR, 11 Dec 2021.
- [6] Sarah Bird et al. Fairlearn: A toolkit for assessing and improving fairness in ai. Technical Report MSR-TR-2020-32, Microsoft, May 2020.
- [7] Nicholas Carlini, Steve Chien, Milad Nasr, Shuang Song, Andreas Terzis, and Florian Tramèr. Membership inference attacks from first principles. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1897–1914, 2022.
- [8] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Úlfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650. USENIX Association, August 2021.
- [9] Huiqiang Chen, Tianqing Zhu, Tao Zhang, Wanlei Zhou, and Philip S. Yu. Privacy and fairness in federated learning: On the perspective of tradeoff. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 56(2), sep 2023.
- [10] Gavin Weiguang Ding et al. Advertorch v0. 1: An adversarial robustness toolbox based on pytorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.07623*, 2019.
- [11] Vasisht Duddu, Sebastian Szyller, and N Asokan. Sok: Unintended interactions among machine learning defenses and risks. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2024.
- [12] Vasisht Duddu, Rui Zhang, and N Asokan. Combining machine learning defenses without conflicts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09776*, 2024.
- [13] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, ITCS ’12, page 214–226, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [14] Matt Fredrikson, Somesh Jha, and Thomas Ristenpart. Model inversion attacks that exploit confidence information and basic countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’15*, page 1322–1333, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [15] Alex Gittens et al. An adversarial perspective on accuracy, robustness, fairness, and privacy: Multilateral tradeoffs in trustworthy ml. *IEEE Access*, 10:120850–120865, 2022.
- [16] Tianyu Gu, Kang Liu, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Sidharth Garg. Badnets: Evaluating backdooring attacks on deep neural networks. *IEEE Access*, 7:47230–47244, 2019.
- [17] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [18] High-Level Expert Group on AI. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy ai. Report, European Commission, Brussels, April 2019.
- [19] White House. Guidance for regulation of artificial intelligence applications. In *Memorandum For The Heads Of Executive Departments And Agencies*, 2020.
- [20] Ruoxi Jia, David Dao, Boxin Wang, Frances Ann Hubis, Nezihe Merve Gurel, Bo Li, Ce Zhang, Costas Spanos, and Dawn Song. Efficient task-specific data valuation for nearest neighbor algorithms. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 12(11):1610–1623, July 2019.
- [21] Emre Kazim, Danielle Mendes Thame Denny, and Adriano Koshiyama. AI auditing and impact assessment: according to the uk information commissioner’s office. *AI and Ethics*, Feb 2021.
- [22] Ron Kohavi. Census Income. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5GP7S>.
- [23] Narine Kokhlikyan et al. Captum: A unified and generic model interpretability library for pytorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07896*, 2020.
- [24] European Union Law. Art. 35 GDPR data protection impact assessment. In *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*, 2018.
- [25] Yige Li, Xixiang Lyu, Nodens Koren, Lingjuan Lyu, Bo Li, and Xingjun Ma. Anti-backdoor learning: Training clean models on poisoned data. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors,

- Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [26] Xiang Ling et al. Deepsec: A uniform platform for security analysis of deep learning model. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 673–690, 2019.
- [27] Shuying Liu and Weihong Deng. Very deep convolutional neural network based image classification using small training sample size. In *2015 3rd IAPR Asian Conference on Pattern Recognition (ACPR)*, pages 730–734, 2015.
- [28] Yugeng Liu et al. MI-doctor: Holistic risk assessment of inference attacks against machine learning models. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 4525–4542, 2022.
- [29] Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.
- [30] Gilles Louppe, Michael Kagan, and Kyle Cranmer. Learning to pivot with adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’17*, page 982–991, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2017. Curran Associates Inc.
- [31] Nils Lukas, Yuxuan Zhang, and Florian Kerschbaum. Deep neural network fingerprinting by conferrable adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [32] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [33] Pratyush Maini, Mohammad Yaghini, and Nicolas Papernot. Dataset inference: Ownership resolution in machine learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [34] Luca Melis, Congzheng Song, Emiliano De Cristofaro, and Vitaly Shmatikov. Exploiting unintended feature leakage in collaborative learning. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 691–706, 2019.
- [35] Sasi Kumar Murakonda and Reza Shokri. MI privacy meter: Aiding regulatory compliance by quantifying the privacy risks of machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.09339*, 2020.
- [36] Milad Nasr, Javier Rando, Nicholas Carlini, Jonathan Hayase, Matthew Jagielski, A. Feder Cooper, Daphne Ippolito, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Florian Tramèr, and Katherine Lee. Scalable extraction of training data from aligned, production language models. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [37] Maria-Irina Nicolae et al. Adversarial robustness toolbox v1. 0.0. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01069*, 2018.
- [38] Tribhuvanesh Orekondy, Bernt Schiele, and Mario Fritz. Knockoff Nets: Stealing Functionality of Black-Box Models. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4949–4958, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, June 2019. IEEE Computer Society.
- [39] Ren Pang et al. Trojanzoo: Towards unified, holistic, and practical evaluation of neural backdoors. In *2022 IEEE 7th European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*, pages 684–702. IEEE, 2022.
- [40] Nicolas Papernot et al. Technical report on the cleverhans v2. 1.0 adversarial examples library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.00768*, 2016.
- [41] Liwei Song, Reza Shokri, and Prateek Mittal. Privacy risks of securing machine learning models against adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS ’19*, page 241–257, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [42] Anshuman Suri, Yifu Lu, Yanjin Chen, and David Evans. Dissecting Distribution Inference. In *2023 IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning (SaTML)*, pages 150–164, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, February 2023. IEEE Computer Society.
- [43] Sebastian Szyller and N. Asokan. Conflicting interactions among protection mechanisms for machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI’23/IAAI’23/EAAI’23*. AAAI Press, 2023.
- [44] Sebastian Szyller, Rui Zhang, Jian Liu, and N Asokan. On the robustness of dataset inference. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [45] Elham Tabassi, Kevin J. Burns, M. Hadjimichael, Andres Molina-Markham, and Julian Sexton. A taxonomy and terminology of adversarial machine learning. In *NIST Interagency/Internal Report*, 2019.

- [46] Florian Tramèr, Fan Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K. Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. Stealing machine learning models via prediction apis. In *Proceedings of the 25th USENIX Conference on Security Symposium, SEC'16*, page 601–618, USA, 2016. USENIX Association.
- [47] Brandon Tran, Jerry Li, and Aleksander Mądry. Spectral signatures in backdoor attacks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'18*, page 8011–8021, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2018. Curran Associates Inc.
- [48] Chengkun Wei et al. Dpmlbench: Holistic evaluation of differentially private machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05900*, 2023.
- [49] Dongxian Wu and Yisen Wang. Adversarial neuron pruning purifies backdoored deep models. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [50] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms, 2017.
- [51] Ashkan Yousefpour et al. Opacus: User-friendly differential privacy library in pytorch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12298*, 2021.
- [52] Brian Hu Zhang, Blake Lemoine, and Margaret Mitchell. Mitigating unwanted biases with adversarial learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society, AIES '18*, page 335–340, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.