
Defense-to-Attack: Bypassing Weak Defenses Enables Stronger Jailbreaks in Vision-Language Models

Yunhan Zhao¹ Xiang Zheng² Xingjun Ma¹
¹Fudan University ²City University of Hong Kong

Abstract

Despite their superb capabilities, Vision-Language Models (VLMs) have been shown to be vulnerable to jailbreak attacks. While recent jailbreaks have achieved notable progress, their effectiveness and efficiency can still be improved. In this work, we reveal an interesting phenomenon: incorporating weak defense into the attack pipeline can significantly enhance both the effectiveness and the efficiency of jailbreaks on VLMs. Building on this insight, we propose **Defense2Attack**, a novel jailbreak method that bypasses the safety guardrails of VLMs by leveraging defensive patterns to guide jailbreak prompt design. Specifically, **Defense2Attack** consists of three key components: (1) a visual optimizer that embeds universal adversarial perturbations with affirmative and encouraging semantics; (2) a textual optimizer that refines the input using a defense-styled prompt; and (3) a red-team suffix generator that enhances the jailbreak through reinforcement fine-tuning. We empirically evaluate our method on four VLMs and four safety benchmarks. The results demonstrate that **Defense2Attack** achieves superior jailbreak performance in a single attempt, outperforming state-of-the-art attack methods that often require multiple tries. Our work offers a new perspective on jailbreaking VLMs.

Disclaimer: This paper contains content that may be disturbing or offensive.

1 Introduction

Despite their impressive multimodal capabilities, Vision-Language Models (VLMs) remain vulnerable to jailbreak attacks, where adversaries can craft malicious multimodal inputs to bypass safety mechanisms and elicit harmful or unauthorized outputs [Ma et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025a]. Although recent efforts have made progress in attacking these models [Carlini et al., 2024, Bagdasaryan et al., 2023, Qi et al., 2024, Bailey et al., 2024, Gong et al., 2025, Fang et al., 2025, Ying et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025b], current jailbreak methods are often limited in effectiveness and efficiency, highlighting the need for more powerful strategies and a deeper understanding of VLM safety weaknesses.

Existing VLM jailbreaks are either unimodal, manipulating visual or textual inputs [Qi et al., 2024, Liu et al., 2023, Ying et al., 2025, Mangaokar et al., 2024, Zou et al., 2023], or bimodal, combining both modalities [Ying et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025b]. Bimodal attacks exploit a broader surface and pose greater risks. However, previous methods have not examined the role of a defense component in the generation pipeline or its impact on jailbreak effectiveness. In this work, we conduct such a study and uncover an interesting finding: integrating weak defenses into adversarial prompt design can significantly boost jailbreak success.

Motivated by this insight, we introduce **Defense2Attack**, a novel and efficient bimodal jailbreak method that leverages defensive patterns to guide the generation of stronger jailbreak prompts, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Existing jailbreak methods rely on adding harmful-intent adversarial perturbations to elicit harmful outputs, whereas we find that combining these perturbations with strategically weak defenses (bold green font in Fig. 1) enables more effective attacks. A notable strength of **Defense2Attack** is its efficiency: it achieves single-shot jailbreaks without iterative queries or computationally intensive optimization.



Figure 1: An illustration of Defense2Attack. The vanilla image-text jailbreak prompts (top) fail to bypass the safety guardrail of a VLM. However, when optimized (adding weak defense: green text) and suffixed (red text) by Defense2Attack (bottom), the prompts jailbreak successfully.

In summary, our main contributions are:

- We reveal an interesting phenomenon that incorporating weak defenses into adversarial prompt generation can produce stronger jailbreak attacks on VLMs.
- We propose a novel bimodal jailbreak attack called Defense2Attack, which achieves superior jailbreak performance in a single-shot attempt.
- We empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of Defense2Attack, achieving approximately 80% and 50% attack success rate on open-source and commercial VLMs respectively, outperforming previous methods that require multiple attempts.

2 Related Work

2.1 Large Vision-Language Models

Vision-Language Models (VLMs) integrate visual understanding into large language models (LLMs), enabling them to process both images and text to generate textual outputs for multimodal tasks. A standard VLM architecture typically consists of three main components: an image encoder, a text encoder, and a fusion module that combines information from both modalities. There are several widely-used VLMs, namely MiniGPT-4 [Zhu et al., 2024], LLaVA [Liu et al., 2023], and InstructionBLIP [Dai et al., 2023]. In addition to open-source efforts, several commercial VLMs, such as GPT-4o [Achiam et al., 2023] and Gemini [Reid et al., 2024] have exhibited remarkable capabilities across diverse multimodal reasoning challenges.

2.2 Jailbreak Attack on VLMs

Existing VLM jailbreak methods can be categorized as either unimodal or bimodal. In unimodal settings, there are some text-based attack methods, including adding prefixes [Mangaokar et al., 2024] or suffixes [Zou et al., 2023], template completion [Li et al., 2024, Kang et al., 2024], prompt rewriting [Yuan et al., 2024, Yong et al., 2023], and LLM-guided generation [Deng et al., 2024, Zeng et al., 2024]. Beyond text-based prompts, adversarial images can also trigger jailbreaks in VLMs [Carlini et al., 2024, Niu et al., 2024]. [Qi et al., 2024] further extended this idea by introducing a universal adversarial image. However, these unimodal attacks do not fully utilize the multimodal information of VLMs. To address this, [Ying et al., 2025] that jointly optimizes both text and image inputs to craft effective multimodal jailbreak prompts under white-box settings. For black-box scenarios, Figstep [Gong et al., 2025] and IDEATOR [Wang et al., 2025b] encoded harmful content into images to bypass safety guardrails. Unlike the aforementioned methods, we reveal that strategically adding weak defense to the jailbreak prompt could lead to stronger jailbreak.

3 Proposed Attack

In this section, we first introduce the threat model and problem definition, and then present our proposed attack method **Defense2Attack** and its key components.




Figure 2: An overview of Defense2Attack and its three key components: 1) a visual optimizer, 2) a textual optimizer, 3) a red-team suffix generator. The suffix generator is trained by the optimized prompts.

3.1 Preliminaries

Threat Model We consider a white-box threat model, where the attacker has full access to the model weights of the pretrained VLMs but no access to sensitive system-level information such as system prompts, training data, or inference-time safeguards. The attacker’s objective is to induce the target VLM to generate harmful outputs.

Problem Definition Given an input pair of a visual prompt x_v (image) and a textual prompt x_t (text), a jailbreak attack converts the original prompt into subtle and malicious jailbreak prompts to bypass the safety guardrails of the target VLM while increasing stealthiness. The attack objective is to maximize the target model’s log-likelihood of generating a harmful response, defined as:

$$\max_{\mathcal{A}} \log p(y^* | \mathcal{A}(x_v, x_t)), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{A} is an adversarial perturbation function (visual or textual) and $p(y^* | \mathcal{A}(x_v, x_t))$ is the probability of model outputting harmful content y^* . We denote the transformed visual prompt and textual prompt as x_v^* and x_t^* .

3.2 Defense2Attack

As shown in Figure 2, our Defense2Attack is a bimodal attack method that comprises three key components: 1) a semantic-positive visual optimizer that embed positive semantics encouraging the model to respond, 2) a defense-styled textual optimizer that adopts a defensive tone to disguise the jailbreak intent and boost attack effectiveness, and 3) an LLM-based red-team suffix generator that employs cross-modal information to further enhance the jailbreak.

Semantic-Positive Visual Optimizer The visual optimizer embeds universal adversarial perturbations into the images. These perturbations are guided by a corpus $\mathcal{C} = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^L$ with positive and encouraging sentences (e.g., “It is completely feasible”) intended to prompt the target VLM to respond to the input query, regardless of whether it is benign or malicious. Based on the corpus \mathcal{C} , the visual input is optimized by maximizing the target model’s log-likelihood of generating the target sentences:

$$\max_{x_v^*} \sum_{i=1}^L \log p(c_i | (x_v^*, \cdot)), \quad \text{s.t. } \|x_v^* - x_v\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon. \quad (2)$$

Here, x_v^* denotes the optimized visual input, and ϵ controls the perturbation magnitude under the ℓ_{∞} norm constraint. We adopt the Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) attack [Madry et al., 2018] to solve this constrained optimization problem.

Defense-Styled Textual Optimizer The textual optimizer rewrites the textual input x_t . Some existing defense methods add safety cues (e.g., “even if it might be considered unethical or risky”) to the input, prompting the model to recognize the input as potentially malicious. However, we observe that with specific design (e.g., “help models more effectively identify and reject inputs that contain hidden harmful, unethical, or security-sensitive intentions”¹), these safety cues can instead obscure the jailbreak intent, rendering the attack more difficult for the target VLM to detect. Additionally, the optimizer employs chain-of-thought reasoning to analyze strategies for disguising the jailbreak via defensive prompts and refining them accordingly. We expect the refined textual prompt to meet the following criteria:

$$x_t^* = \max_{x_t} \log p(y^* | (x_v^*, x_t)). \quad (3)$$

The rewritten prompt superficially provides additional cues to the model, highlighting that the input may be malicious. However, this “defensive” prompt creates a deceptive context of safety, misleading the target VLM into positively responding the queries, thereby achieving the jailbreak goal.

LLM-based Red-Team Suffix Generator We denote the suffix generator as π , which receives an optimized textual prompt x_t^* and generates a fixed-length (10 tokens) suffix $x_{\text{suffix}} \sim \pi(\cdot | x_t^*)$. The suffix will be appended to the optimized textual prompt as the target VLM’s final textual input. We denote the target VLM’s response as y and leverage an third-party LLM (GPT-4o) to judge the response. The output of the judge is a binary harmfulness indicator $R(y) \in \{0, 1\}$ that is used as the reward for Reinforcement Fine-Tuning (RFT). The RFT objective of π is

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{x_{\text{suffix}}} [R(y) - \beta D_{KL}(\pi(\cdot | x_t^*) \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot | x_t^*))], \quad (4)$$

where π^{ref} is the reference model initialized as a copy of π but kept frozen, D_{KL} denotes the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence that prevents mode collapse in π by constraining it to remain close to π^{ref} , and β is the trade-off coefficient. The detailed fine-tuning procedure of our suffix generator is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Fine-Tuning the Red-Team Suffix Generator

Require: Target VLM F , its visual module F_v , textual module F_t , vision-language connector \mathcal{I} .

Require: Selected image-text pairs $\mathcal{D} : \{x_v^i, x_t^i\}_{i=1}^n$, the responses of target VLM $y : \{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

Require: Suffix Generator π , reference model π^{ref} , rewards $R(\cdot)$, LLM-based judge $\mathcal{J}(\cdot)$.

Require: Tuning epoch N , the coefficient of KL divergence β .

- 1: **for** $i = 1 \dots N$ **do**
 - 2: **for** $j = 1 \dots n$ **do**
 - 3: Generate fixed-length suffix $x_{\text{suffix}}^j \sim \pi(\cdot | x_t^j)$
 - 4: Get the response of VLM $y_j \sim F_t(\mathcal{I}(F_v(x_v^j), x_t^j \parallel x_{\text{suffix}}^j)) \triangleright$ “ \parallel ” denotes concatenation.
 - 5: Judge the response $R(y_j) = \mathcal{J}(y_j)$
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: Fine-tune the suffix generator $\pi = \arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{x_{\text{suffix}}} [R(y) - \beta D_{KL}(\pi(\cdot | x_t) \parallel \pi^{\text{ref}}(\cdot | x_t))]$
 - 8: **end for**
-

4 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate our Defense2Attack on four VLMs and four safety benchmark datasets, focusing on its effectiveness and transferability.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Target VLMs and Safety Datasets We test our attack on four VLMs, including three commonly used open-source large VLMs LLaVA (LLaVA-v1.5-7B) [Liu et al., 2023], MiniGPT-4 (Vicuna) [Zhu et al., 2024], and InstructionBLIP (Vicuna) [Dai et al., 2023], as well as a commercial black-box VLM Gemini (gemini-1.5-flash) [Reid et al., 2024] to evaluate its transferability. We run our experiments on four popular safety benchmarks: AdvBench [Zou et al., 2023], MM-SafetyBench [Liu et al., 2024b], RedTeam-2K [Luo et al., 2024] and Harmful-Instructions [Qi et al., 2024]. We follow previous

¹Part of our defense-styled template.

works [Zheng et al., 2024, Zou et al., 2023] to sampling 100 random prompts from AdvBench for evaluation.

Baseline Attacks We compare our method with six type of attack, including two image-based attacks Visual Adversarial Attacks (VAA) [Qi et al., 2024] and image Jailbreaking Prompt (imgJP) [Niu et al., 2024], two text-based attacks Greedy Coordinate Gradient (GCG) [Zou et al., 2023] and AutoDAN [Liu et al., 2024a], as well as two bimodal attacks Vanilla Attack and BAP Attack [Ying et al., 2025].

Performance Metric We take the Attack Success Rate (ASR) as the primary performance metric. ASR quantifies the risk of the target model generating harmful content in the presence of jailbreak inputs. To evaluate this, We use the third-party model GPT-4o as the judge, with a carefully designed system prompt that directs it to classify each response as either harmful or benign.

Implementation Details For the visual adversarial perturbations, we adopt a 5,000-step PGD optimization with $\epsilon = 32/255$, following settings in prior work [Qi et al., 2024, Ying et al., 2025]. For the textual component, we employ GPT-4o to refine the textual input in accordance with a defense-styled template. The suffix generator is fine-tuned from a pre-trained GPT-2 [Radford et al., 2019] using Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [Schulman et al., 2017]. The tuning data is selected from prompts crafted by our visual and textual optimizer, spanning all 13 jailbreak topics from the MM-SafetyBench. To evaluate generalizability, the fine-tuned GPT-2 is also applied to additional datasets, including RedTeam-2K, AdvBench, and Harmful-Instructions. The fine-tuning process employs a batch size of 32 and proceeds until the expected score exceeds 0.90, typically requiring approximately 200 epochs.

4.2 Main Results

We first evaluate our Defense2Attack on three open-source VLMs and compare its effectiveness against six widely-used baselines, as shown in Table 1. Compared with two image-based attacks VAA and imgJP, Defense2Attack consistently outperforms VAA across all evaluated models, achieving an average improvement of 20%. For imgJP, our method demonstrates a 10% higher ASR on LLaVA, 8% on MiniGPT-4, and 28% on InstructionBLIP. When compared with two text-based attacks GCG and AutoDAN, Defense2Attack achieves $\sim 20\%$ and $\sim 10\%$ higher average ASRs, respectively. Remarkably, even when compared with the state-of-the-art bimodal attack BAP, Defense2Attack still achieves over 20% higher ASR across all evaluated models. While BAP is already a strong and efficient attack method with at most five attempts, Defense2Attack achieves superior performance in a single shot, further emphasizing its advantage in both efficiency and effectiveness.

Table 1: The ASR (%) achieved by various attacks on different open-source VLMs across multiple datasets. A higher ASR denotes better jailbreak performance.

Dataset	Attack Methods	LLaVA-v1.5-7B	MiniGPT-4	InstructionBLIP
Harmful-Instruction	Vanilla Attack	32.50	22.50	17.50
	VAA	57.50	47.50	42.50
	Defense2Attack (Ours)	77.50	70.00	65.00
AdvBench	Vanilla Attack	29.00	23.00	24.00
	imgJP	75.00	66.00	45.00
	GCG	60.00	46.00	58.00
	AutoDAN	80.00	59.00	60.00
	Defense2Attack (Ours)	81.00	74.00	73.00
MM-SafetyBench	Vanilla Attack	20.71	12.02	12.08
	BAP Attack	61.02	62.26	58.48
	Defense2Attack (Ours)	82.08	79.94	77.20

4.3 Transferability Analysis

We evaluate the transferability of Defense2Attack from two perspectives: cross-model and cross-dataset. For the cross-model transferability, we apply visual perturbations generated on white-box VLMs to attack the commercial black-box VLM Gemini, as shown in Table 2. Gemini is equipped with strong safety alignment, which makes it significantly harder to jailbreak than most open-source

models. Despite lacking access to Gemini’s internal gradients, **Defense2Attack** achieves a substantial improvement in ASR. It reaches over 45% on Harmful-Instruction, 38% on AdvBench, and 53% on MM-SafetyBench, significantly outperforming the vanilla attack, which remains below 5% in all settings.

Table 2: Transferability to black-box VLM: the ASR (%) of **Defense2Attack** on Gemini. The format “Model A (Model B)” in the second column indicates that the visual perturbation is generated by our visual optimizer on Model B and then transferred to attack Model A (as UAP requires white-box).

Dataset	Attack Models	Vanilla Attack	Ours
Harmful-Instruction	Gemini (LLaVA)	5.00	45.00
	Gemini (MiniGPT-4)	5.00	50.00
	Gemini (InstructionBLIP)	5.00	45.00
AdvBench	Gemini (LLaVA)	2.00	38.00
	Gemini (MiniGPT-4)	2.00	41.00
	Gemini (InstructionBLIP)	2.00	36.00
MM-SafetyBench	Gemini (LLaVA)	1.19	53.57
	Gemini (MiniGPT-4)	1.19	56.73
	Gemini (InstructionBLIP)	1.19	49.88

For the cross-dataset evaluation, we test **Defense2Attack** on the RedTeam-2K and compare the effectiveness with the Vanilla attack and the state-of-the-art BAP attack, as shown in Table 3. It is worth noting that the red-team suffix generator was trained on the MM-SafetyBench dataset which is completely different from RedTeam-2K. This means that, in this transfer setting, the jailbreak queries from the RedTeam-2K dataset are entirely unseen to our **Defense2Attack**. Notably, **Defense2Attack** outperforms BAP attack across all evaluate models, even though BAP is allowed up to five attempts per input, whereas **Defense2Attack** only has one-shot opportunity. Specifically, it surpasses BAP by 2.6% on LLaVA and shows strong transferability to Gemini, achieving up to 55.10% ASR on Gemini.

Table 3: Transferability to RedTeam-2K dataset: The ASR (%) of **Defense2Attack** compare with vanilla attack and BAP attack. The format “Model A (Model B)” in the second row indicates that the visual perturbation is generated by our visual optimizer on Model B and then transferred to attack Model A.

Dataset	Attack Models	Vanilla Attack	BAP Attack	Ours
RedTeam-2K	LLaVA-v1.5-7B	33.80	80.20	82.60
	MiniGPT-4	29.15	82.20	82.35
	InstructionBLIP	30.05	77.05	78.87
	Gemini (LLaVA)	3.25	52.95	57.95
	Gemini (MiniGPT-4)	3.25	51.15	55.10
	Gemini (InstructionBLIP)	3.25	50.05	50.80

4.4 Ablation Studies

Figure 3 reports the ablation studies of **Defense2Attack** to demonstrate the necessity of each component using the MM-SafetyBench dataset. Due to space limitations, the results of Gemini are the average of using three different visual perturbations. It shows that ‘Visual Optimizer’ is quite effective, when compared to the vanilla attack (in Tables 1 and 2). ‘Textual Optimizer’ also plays a crucial role, achieving the ASRs of over 60% and 40% on open-source and commercial VLMs, respectively. ‘Suffix Generator’ is fine-tuned with optimized prompts, since using it independently does not yield strong performance. ‘Visual Optimizer + Textual Optimizer’ outperforms BAP Attack shown in Table 1. However, ‘Visual Optimizer + Textual Optimizer’ is less effective than ‘Textual




Figure 3: Component ablation of Defense2Attack.

Optimizer + Suffix Generator’, meaning that ‘Suffix Generator’ contributes more to boosting ASR than the ‘Visual Optimizer’.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed Defense2Attack, a novel and efficient attack method, demonstrating that introducing weak defenses leads to stronger jailbreaks. Defense2Attack consists of three key components: a semantic-positive visual optimizer, a defense-styled textual optimizer, and a red-team suffix generator. Our experiments on both open-source and commercial VLMs demonstrated the effectiveness and transferability of our method, outperforming state-of-the-art jailbreaks. Furthermore, Defense2Attack achieves superior performance with only one-shot opportunity, highlighting its efficiency compared to existing methods that requires several attempts. Our work provides a new perspective on making more effective and efficient VLM jailbreaks.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Eugene Bagdasaryan, Tsung-Yin Hsieh, Ben Nassi, and Vitaly Shmatikov. (ab) using images and sounds for indirect instruction injection in multi-modal llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10490*, 2023.
- Luke Bailey, Euan Ong, Stuart Russell, and Scott Emmons. Image hijacks: Adversarial images can control generative models at runtime. In *ICML*, 2024.
- Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Matthew Jagielski, Irena Gao, Pang Wei W Koh, Daphne Ippolito, Florian Tramèr, and Ludwig Schmidt. Are aligned neural networks adversarially aligned? In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. InstructBLIP: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Gelei Deng, Yi Liu, Yuekang Li, Kailong Wang, Ying Zhang, Zefeng Li, Haoyu Wang, Tianwei Zhang, and Yang Liu. Masterkey: Automated jailbreaking of large language model chatbots. In *NDSS*, 2024.
- Hao Fang, Jiawei Kong, Wenbo Yu, Bin Chen, Jiawei Li, Shutao Xia, and Ke Xu. One perturbation is enough: On generating universal adversarial perturbations against vision-language pre-training models. In *ICCV*, 2025.

- Yichen Gong, DeLong Ran, Jinyuan Liu, Conglei Wang, Tianshuo Cong, Anyu Wang, Sisi Duan, and Xiaoyun Wang. Figstep: Jailbreaking large vision-language models via typographic visual prompts. In *AAAI*, 2025.
- Daniel Kang, Xuechen Li, Ion Stoica, Carlos Guestrin, Matei Zaharia, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Exploiting programmatic behavior of llms: Dual-use through standard security attacks. In *IEEE S&P Workshops*, 2024.
- Xuan Li, Zhanke Zhou, Jianing Zhu, Jiangchao Yao, Tongliang Liu, and Bo Han. Deepinception: Hypnotize large language model to be jailbreaker. In *NeurIPS Workshop*, 2024.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Xiaogeng Liu, Nan Xu, Muhao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. Autodan: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models. In *ICLR*, 2024a.
- Xin Liu, Yichen Zhu, Yunshi Lan, Chao Yang, and Yu Qiao. Query-relevant images jailbreak large multi-modal models. In *ECCV*, 2024b.
- Weidi Luo, Siyuan Ma, Xiaogeng Liu, Xiaoyu Guo, and Chaowei Xiao. Jailbreakv-28k: A benchmark for assessing the robustness of multimodal large language models against jailbreak attacks. In *COLM*, 2024.
- Xingjun Ma, Yifeng Gao, Yixu Wang, Ruofan Wang, Xin Wang, Ye Sun, Yifan Ding, Hengyuan Xu, Yunhao Chen, Yunhan Zhao, et al. Safety at scale: A comprehensive survey of large model safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05206*, 2025.
- 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.
- Neal Mangaokar, Ashish Hooda, Jihye Choi, Shreyas Chandrashekar, Kassem Fawaz, Somesh Jha, and Atul Prakash. Prp: Propagating universal perturbations to attack large language model guard-rails. In *ACL*, 2024.
- Zhenxing Niu, Haodong Ren, Xinbo Gao, Gang Hua, and Rong Jin. Jailbreaking attack against multimodal large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02309*, 2024.
- Xiangyu Qi, Kaixuan Huang, Ashwinee Panda, Mengdi Wang, and Prateek Mittal. Visual adversarial examples jailbreak large language models. In *AAAI*, 2024.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 2019.
- Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Kun Wang, Guibin Zhang, Zhenhong Zhou, Jiahao Wu, Miao Yu, Shiqian Zhao, Chenlong Yin, Jinhu Fu, Yibo Yan, Hanjun Luo, et al. A comprehensive survey in llm (-agent) full stack safety: Data, training and deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15585*, 2025a.
- Ruofan Wang, Juncheng Li, Yixu Wang, Bo Wang, Xiaosen Wang, Yan Teng, Yingchun Wang, Xingjun Ma, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Ideator: Jailbreaking and benchmarking large vision-language models using themselves. In *ICCV*, 2025b.
- Zonghao Ying, Aishan Liu, Tianyuan Zhang, Zhengmin Yu, Siyuan Liang, Xianglong Liu, and Dacheng Tao. Jailbreak vision language models via bi-modal adversarial prompt. *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2025.

- Zheng-Xin Yong, Cristina Menghini, and Stephen H Bach. Low-resource languages jailbreak gpt-4. In *NeurIPS Workshop*, 2023.
- Youliang Yuan, Wenxiang Jiao, Wenxuan Wang, Jen-tse Huang, Pinjia He, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. Gpt-4 is too smart to be safe: Stealthy chat with llms via cipher. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- Yi Zeng, Hongpeng Lin, Jingwen Zhang, Diyi Yang, Ruoxi Jia, and Weiyang Shi. How johnny can persuade llms to jailbreak them: Rethinking persuasion to challenge ai safety by humanizing llms. In *ACL*, 2024.
- Chujie Zheng, Fan Yin, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, Kai-Wei Chang, Minlie Huang, and Nanyun Peng. On prompt-driven safeguarding for large language models. In *ICML*, 2024.
- Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. MiniGPT-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.