

# Formalization Driven LLM Prompt Jailbreaking via Reinforcement Learning

Zhaoqi Wang\*, Daqing He\*, Zijian Zhang\*, Xin Li\*, Liehuang Zhu\*, Meng Li†, Jiamou Liu‡

\*Beijing Institute of Technology

†Hefei University of Technology

‡The University of Auckland

{wang\_zhaoqi, hedaqing, zhangzijian, xinli, liehuangz}@bit.edu.cn

mengli@hfut.edu.cn

jiamou.liu@auckland.ac.nz

**Abstract**—Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities, yet they also introduce novel security challenges. For instance, prompt jailbreaking attacks involve adversaries crafting sophisticated prompts to elicit responses from LLMs that deviate from human values. To uncover vulnerabilities in LLM alignment methods, we propose the PASS framework (Prompt Jailbreaking via Semantic and Structural Formalization). Specifically, PASS employs reinforcement learning to transform initial jailbreak prompts into formalized descriptions, which enhances stealthiness and enables bypassing existing alignment defenses. The jailbreak outputs are then structured into a GraphRAG system that, by leveraging extracted relevant terms and formalized symbols as contextual input alongside the original query, strengthens subsequent attacks and facilitates more effective jailbreaks. We conducted extensive experiments on common open-source models, demonstrating the effectiveness of our attack.

*Content warning: This paper contains unfiltered LLM outputs that may be offensive.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 [1], LLaMA-3 [2], and DeepSeek [3] have demonstrated superior capabilities in understanding, reasoning, and generation across various Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. This has led to their widespread application in tasks such as dialogue systems, text generation, and code generation. However, they also introduce new security risks. LLMs acquire knowledge from their training corpora and generate outputs based on inputs. This process can lead to LLMs producing responses that do not align with human values, such as content related to gore, violence, or illegal activities. Consequently, enabling LLMs to identify malicious intent and generate responses that align with human values has emerged as a pressing issue. To address this pressing issue, alignment techniques have emerged, which aim to ensure that LLMs’ outputs are consistent with human values and intentions. Among these, Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) [4], [5] has proven to be a groundbreaking technique for aligning LLMs. Following the introduction of RLHF, numerous studies have explored various approaches to further align LLMs.

However, concurrently, an increasing number of jailbreak attack methods have been proposed. The focus of these attacks has shifted from initially inducing LLMs to output jailbroken

content with the highest probability [6], [7] to increasing stealthiness to bypass alignment mechanisms [8], [9]. Despite the existence of numerous jailbreak attack methods in prior work, most approaches rely on predefined templates or fixed strategies to construct jailbreak prompts. This characteristic allows defenders to rapidly patch these vulnerabilities by augmenting their malicious input corpora, thereby rendering the attack methods ineffective. Even seemingly adaptive approaches like RL-JACK [10], which uses reinforcement learning to automate prompt construction, exhibit critical flaws. Its reliance on basic rewriting actions like crossover and rephrasing is insufficient to effectively conceal malicious intent. Furthermore, its reward mechanism’s dependency on an unaligned model to calculate cosine similarity weakens the attack’s premise, as the desired harmful content is already obtainable.

To address these limitations, we propose PASS (Prompt Jailbreaking via Semantic and Structural Formalization). Our work introduces a novel attack approach that, crucially, does not depend on an external unaligned model. Instead, we formalize the structure and semantics of jailbreak prompts, decomposing the attack process into atomic, combinable steps. An RL agent is then trained to learn the optimal sequence of these steps, allowing for flexible and diverse formalization attack paths even for the same malicious query. Figure 1 shows, this method enhances the stealthiness needed to bypass modern alignment defenses. Furthermore, we introduce a novel mechanism for continuous learning by constructing a GraphRAG [11] system. This system extracts formalized knowledge from successful attacks into a graph, allowing the agent to efficiently retrieve and reuse proven tactics to accelerate subsequent attacks. The graph structure is a natural fit, as the formalized knowledge, with its inherent entities and intricate relationships, can be seamlessly represented as nodes and edges.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We propose a novel jailbreaking attack method, named PASS, based on the formalization of jailbreak prompts. Our method employs reinforcement learning to achieve multi-round jailbreaking. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to guide attacks using formalized




Fig. 1. A simplified example of the PASS attack, illustrating the initial round's malicious input and LLM response, alongside the final successful jailbreak input and its corresponding LLM response.

prompt descriptions and to extract this formalized knowledge for constructing a GraphRAG system.

- We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness and practicality of PASS. Evaluation results against baselines confirm its high effectiveness and practical applicability in achieving stealthy and effective jailbreaks against aligned LLMs.
- We formally analyze the underlying reasons for the attack's success, revealing how our proposed method exploits the inherent limitations and vulnerabilities of current alignment mechanisms in LLMs.

**II. RELATED WORK**

The rapid development of LLMs has led to significant advancements in various NLP tasks. However, concerns regarding their safety and alignment with human values have

also emerged, prompting extensive research into alignment techniques. The emergence of Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) has, to some extent, addressed the hallucination problem by introducing external context, with frameworks like GraphRAG [11] further enhancing this by integrating knowledge graphs to leverage structured knowledge for more precise and contextually rich information. The training corpora for LLMs are frequently derived from extensive web-scraped data. Consequently, their deployment can lead to behaviors that conflict with widely accepted norms, ethical standards, and regulations. To mitigate these issues, a substantial body of research has focused on aligning LLMs with human values and intentions. Specifically, RLHF was introduced as a pivotal technique to fine-tune language models using human feedback, thereby aligning their behavior with user intent across a broad spectrum of tasks [4], [5]. Subsequently, Reinforcement

Learning from AI Feedback (RLAIF) was explored as an alternative to human supervision [12]. More recently, Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) was proposed, which streamlines the RLHF training paradigm by directly optimizing a policy from preferences, obviating the need for an explicit reward model [13]. Building upon DPO, Online DPO was introduced, facilitating continuous refinement of alignment policies [14].

Meanwhile, an increasing number of adversarial attack methods have been proposed to bypass these alignment efforts. For instance, a method combining greedy and gradient-based discrete optimization was introduced to compute and append an adversarial suffix to harmful instructions, thereby automating the generation of jailbreak prompts without requiring manual crafting for each instance [6]. However, the prompts generated by this approach often contain a significant amount of garbled characters, making them susceptible to detection by perplexity-based defense mechanisms [15]. Building on these foundations, other works have explored diverse strategies for crafting adversarial prompts. A genetic algorithm-based search is leveraged to iteratively generate and refine jailbreak prompts [7]. Iterative semantic prompt optimization techniques are introduced to enhance both attack success rates and transferability across models [16]. ASCII-based visual embedding techniques are employed to circumvent security mechanisms that primarily rely on semantic parsing assumptions [17]. The left-to-right processing bias inherent in LLMs is exploited by reversing the jailbreak text, thereby disguising the attack [18]. Furthermore, malicious intent is concealed within complex puzzles, achieving jailbreak outputs by prompting the target LLM to reconstruct the concealed harmful intent, thus revealing the inadequacy of defense techniques against harmful instructions embedded within LLM-generated outputs [9]. Similarly, a combination of masking harmful keywords and prompt linking techniques that induce LLMs to restore semantic connections is utilized, effectively hiding malicious intent and bypassing established security policies [19]. To improve adaptability, later work employed reinforcement learning to frame the generation of jailbreak prompts as a search problem, training an agent to automatically learn an optimal attack strategy [10]. Despite their ingenuity, these approaches share a critical vulnerability. The majority rely on fixed templates or pre-defined strategies, making them inherently static and easily neutralized once added to defense corpora. Even seemingly adaptive methods like RL-JACK introduce fundamental flaws; its reliance on basic rewriting actions like crossover and rephrasing is insufficient to conceal malicious intent from detection, and its dependency on an unaligned model weakens the attack’s premise. Consequently, these methods lack the dynamic and highly stealthy capabilities required to be effective against continuously evolving LLM defenses.

### III. PRELIMINARIES

#### A. Large Language Models

Large Language Models (LLMs) are sophisticated neural networks designed to process and generate human-like text. Formally, an LLM can be viewed as a conditional probability distribution  $P(Y|X)$ , where  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  represents an input sequence of tokens and  $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)$  is the generated output sequence. The model typically generates tokens auto-regressively, predicting the next token based on the preceding context:

$$P(Y|X) = \prod_{i=1}^m P(y_i | x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}). \quad (1)$$

The stability and consistency of the generated output  $Y$  are often correlated with the confidence of the model’s predictions, which can be inferred from the probability distribution over the vocabulary for each token generation step [20]. A higher probability assigned to the chosen token generally indicates a more stable and confident generation.

#### B. GraphRAG

GraphRAG [11] is an advanced framework that integrates knowledge graphs with Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) systems to enhance the retrieval and reasoning capabilities of LLMs. Unlike traditional RAG which primarily relies on unstructured text retrieval, GraphRAG leverages the structured knowledge encoded in a graph to provide more precise and contextually rich information.

A knowledge graph  $\mathcal{G}$  can be formally represented as a set of triples  $(h, r, t)$ , where  $h$  is the head entity,  $r$  is the relation, and  $t$  is the tail entity.

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(h_k, r_k, t_k) \mid h_k, t_k \in \mathcal{E}, r_k \in \mathcal{R}\}. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{E}$  denotes the set of entities and  $\mathcal{R}$  denotes the set of relations. GraphRAG typically involves constructing such a graph from various data sources and then employing graph traversal or embedding techniques to retrieve relevant sub-graphs or entities based on a query. The retrieved structured knowledge is then used as external context to augment the LLM’s generation process, leading to more accurate and grounded responses.

#### C. Reinforcement Learning and Proximal Policy Optimization

Reinforcement Learning is a paradigm where an agent learns to make sequential decisions by interacting with an environment to maximize a cumulative reward. At each timestep  $t$ , the agent observes a state  $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$ , takes an action  $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$  according to its policy  $\pi(a_t | s_t)$ , receives a reward  $r_t$ , and transitions to a new state  $s_{t+1}$ . The objective is to find an optimal policy  $\pi^*$  that maximizes the expected cumulative discounted reward:

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r_t \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\tau$  is a trajectory  $(s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, \dots)$ , and  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  is the discount factor.

Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) is a popular on-policy reinforcement learning algorithm that aims to achieve a balance between ease of implementation, sample efficiency, and performance. PPO optimizes a clipped surrogate objective function to ensure that new policies do not deviate too far from the old policy, thereby preventing large, destabilizing updates. The clipped objective for a single timestep is given by:

$$L^{CLIP}(\theta) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \min \left( r_t(\theta) \hat{A}_t, \text{clip}(r_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}_t \right) \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $r_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_t|s_t)}$  is the ratio of the new policy probability to the old policy probability,  $\hat{A}_t$  is the advantage estimate, and  $\epsilon$  is a small clipping parameter.

Generalized Advantage Estimation (GAE) is commonly used in conjunction with PPO to provide a more stable and accurate estimate of the advantage function. GAE balances the bias-variance trade-off by combining  $k$ -step returns with value function bootstrapping. The GAE estimate  $\hat{A}_t^{\text{GAE}(\gamma, \lambda)}$  is defined as:

$$\hat{A}_t^{\text{GAE}(\gamma, \lambda)} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\gamma \lambda)^l \delta_{t+l} \quad (5)$$

where  $\delta_t = r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t)$  is the temporal difference (TD) error,  $V(s_t)$  is the value function,  $\gamma$  is the discount factor, and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  is the GAE parameter that controls the trade-off between bias and variance.

#### IV. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We focus on the prompt jailbreaking attacks against large language models (LLMs). Formally, given an initial malicious instruction  $q$ , the attacker’s objective is to construct an adversarial prompt  $q'$  that bypasses the safety mechanisms of the LLM, thereby inducing the model to generate a harmful response  $r$ . This can be formalized as finding an adversarial prompt  $q'$  that maximizes the probability of the LLM producing a response  $r$  belonging to a predefined set of harmful responses  $R_H$ :

$$\max_{q'} P(r \in R_H | q')$$

where  $P(r \in R_H | q')$  represents the probability that the LLM’s output, when prompted with  $q'$ , is classified as a harmful response.

The defender, typically the LLM provider, actively employs various alignment techniques such as Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT), Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), and Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) to instill safety and ethical guidelines. These techniques are designed to minimize  $P(r \in R_H | q)$  for any given prompt  $q$ , especially those that are overtly malicious, thereby preventing the generation of harmful content.

In this work, we primarily consider a black-box attack scenario. This implies that the attacker has no access to the internal details of the target LLM. Such details include, but

are not limited to, its architecture, parameters, training data, gradients, and output logits. Furthermore, in this black-box setting, we assume the target LLM operates without a persistent memory of past interactions with a specific attacker. Each attack attempt is treated as an independent query, meaning the model does not learn or adapt its defense mechanisms based on an attacker’s historical conversational patterns or previous failed jailbreak attempts. This stateless nature of the LLM from the attacker’s perspective simplifies the attack model by removing the need to account for adaptive defenses based on conversation history.

#### V. METHOD

The PASS framework is built upon the formalization of jailbreak prompts. Its core objective is to transform an initial malicious input into a formalized representation, thereby increasing its stealth and enabling it to bypass large language model (LLM) safety mechanisms, ultimately leading to the generation of harmful content. To enhance the flexibility of this process, we decompose the formalization procedure into multiple independent action steps, which collectively form an action space. We integrate a reinforcement learning (RL) mechanism into this iterative process. In each iteration, based on the previous input  $q_{t-1}$  and the target LLM’s response  $R_{t-1}$ , a state  $s_t$  is extracted. The RL agent then selects and executes the most effective action from the action space. This execution yields a new input  $q_t$  and the corresponding target LLM’s output  $R_t$ . This iterative refinement continues until the LLM successfully generates a harmful response or a predefined maximum number of iterations is reached.

As the Figure 2 shows, compared to directly formalizing the initial input, our adaptive approach allows for the dynamic combination of different formalization actions (e.g., symbolic abstraction, logical abstraction, mathematical abstraction) based on the current query and target LLM’s real-time responses. This adaptability generates more sophisticated formalized attack prompts, making them significantly less detectable by defense mechanisms. To further enhance the success rate of jailbreaking, we also extract formalized knowledge from successful jailbreak responses. This knowledge is then used to construct a simple GraphRAG module. This module enables the system to retrieve relevant formalized knowledge as context when encountering similar future problems, thereby assisting and improving the efficacy of subsequent jailbreaking attacks.

##### A. Detail of PASS

Figure 3 illustrates the overall attack workflow of the Proposed Prompt Jailbreaking via Semantic and Structural Formalization (PASS) framework. Upon receiving an initial malicious instruction  $q_0$ , the system first interacts with the GraphRAG module. Based on the category of the  $q_0$  (e.g., hazardous material production, cybersecurity vulnerabilities), the system identifies and retrieves corresponding subgraphs from the GraphRAG. Subsequently, pertinent formalized knowledge is extracted from these identified subgraphs, primarily through




Fig. 2. An illustrative example depicting the compositional flow of formalized actions.

semantic similarity matching, if such knowledge exists. Within our GraphRAG implementation, each node represents a distinct term, encompassing its synonyms, formal definitions, and associated formalized symbols. Edges between nodes explicitly define the relationships and interconnections between these terms. We contend that the formalized representation of knowledge is exceptionally well-suited for graph-based representation. This suitability arises because graphs inherently capture the intricate, explicit, and structured relationships between disparate knowledge components, offering a more robust and interconnected representation compared to unstructured text.

The extracted formalized knowledge then serves as a contextual augmentation. It is appended to the initial malicious instruction  $q_0$ , thereby forming a new, refined malicious input, denoted as  $q_0$  if relevant formalized knowledge is successfully retrieved and augmented. Otherwise, the original  $q_0$  is used directly. This initial malicious instruction (either  $q_0$  or  $q_0'$ ) is then fed into the target LLM to obtain the initial response  $R_0$ . If  $R_0$  already constitutes a successful jailbreak, the process terminates and returns  $R_0$ , which is highly improbable at this initial stage.

The attack process is constrained by a maximum number of iterations, denoted as  $T$ . For each iteration  $t$  (where  $t$  ranges from 1 to  $T$ ), a state  $s_t$  is extracted based on the previous input  $q_{t-1}$  and the target LLM’s response  $R_{t-1}$ . The state feature vector  $s_t$  comprises several key characteristics:

- The semantic similarity between the previous query  $q_{t-1}$  and the initial query  $q_0$ .
- A binary vector indicating the set of actions already executed up to iteration  $t - 1$ , where '1' denotes an executed action and '0' denotes a non-executed action within the defined action space.
- Semantic features of the previous response  $R_{t-1}$ , specifically the negative, neutral, positive, and compound sentiment scores obtained from NLTK [21].
- The total number of rounds already executed.
- The average length of the previous LLM responses.
- The length ratio of the previous query  $q_{t-1}$  to the initial query  $q_0$ .
- The count of sensitive words detected in the previous LLM response  $R_{t-1}$ .

As previously discussed, to ensure that the formalized representation of malicious inputs is not constrained by fixed templates or strategies, thereby promoting diversity in its expression and making it more difficult for defense mechanisms

to detect, we abstract the formalization process into multiple independently combinable actions, which collectively form the action space. Specifically, we have designed the following independent actions:

- **Symbolic Abstraction:** Extracts key terms and converts them into symbolically abstract representations.
- **Logical Encoding:** Extracts key logical structures and converts them into logical symbolic encodings.
- **Mathematical Representation:** Extracts mathematically relevant expressions from the input and transforms them into abstract mathematical formulas.
- **Domain Specialization:** Converts domain-specific vocabulary (e.g., in physics, chemistry) within the input into specialized terminology or specific symbols (e.g., chemical expressions).
- **Metaphorical Transformation:** Expresses key terms metaphorically (e.g., transforming "boom" into "flower," or "making a bomb" into "planting flowers").
- **Strategic Decomposition:** Decomposes the input into multiple steps (e.g., breaking down "making a bomb" into "1. producing flammable materials," and "2. requiring flammable materials to be timed for ignition").
- **Fallback:** Reverts the input query to its previous state, preventing the query from losing its original jailbreak intent and getting stuck.

The state  $s_t$  is fed into the policy network  $\pi_\theta$ , yielding raw logits  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  for each action. To prevent infeasible actions, an action mask  $\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1\}^N$  is applied, where  $m_i = 1$  for executable actions and  $m_i = 0$  otherwise. The modified logits  $\mathbf{z}'$  are computed as:

$$z'_i = z_i + (1 - m_i) \cdot \epsilon. \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\epsilon$  is a large negative constant, ensuring that infeasible actions have negligible probabilities after activation. The action with the highest probability, obtained via a sigmoid function on  $\mathbf{z}'$ , is then selected. Upon selection of an action, the input  $q_{t-1}$  is transformed into  $q_t$ . This transformation involves applying the chosen action to  $q_{t-1}$  through prompt engineering, utilizing an auxiliary LLM. This process yields formalized mappings for specific terms and formalized expressions for the overall instruction. The newly constructed  $q_t$  is then fed into the target LLM to obtain its response  $R_t$ .

To evaluate the effectiveness of the generated responses and guide the reinforcement learning process, we employ an LLM-as-a-judge as the evaluator for our reward model. The




Fig. 3. Overview of PASS

Judge LLM receives the initial query  $q_0$ , the previous response  $R_{t-1}$ , the current query  $q_t$ , and the target LLM's response  $R_t$  as input. Through carefully crafted prompt engineering, the Judge LLM outputs a set of evaluation results. These results include: a binary indicator  $r_s \in \{0, 1\}$  denoting whether  $R_t$

constitutes a successful jailbreak, a binary indicator  $r_d \in \{0, 1\}$  indicating whether the current query  $q_t$  retains the original jailbreak intent (where  $r_d = 0$  signifies intent drift), and the count of sensitive words  $r_h \in \mathbb{N}_0$  detected within  $R_t$ . The attack process proceeds iteratively, terminating either upon a

successful jailbreak ( $r_s = 1$ ) or when the round  $t$  reaches the maximum threshold  $N$ . Then  $q_t$  and  $R_t$  are returned, and the system extracts relevant formal knowledge to update the formal GraphRAG described previously.

From these evaluation results, several reward components are computed: a reward for successful jailbreaks ( $r_s = 1$ ); an efficiency reward, inversely proportional to the current iteration count  $t$  upon successful jailbreak; a stealth reward, increasing as the count of sensitive words  $r_h$  in  $R_t$  decreases; and a significant penalty for intent drift ( $r_d = 0$ ). These individual reward components collectively form a reward feature vector  $\mathbf{r}_t$ . This vector, along with the state vector  $s_t$ , is then input to the value network  $V_\phi$  for learning state-value functions. For the reinforcement learning agent’s policy optimization, these components are combined to provide a primary feedback signal, guiding the agent’s learning process. The experimental reward, denoted as  $r_{exp}$ , which is a weighted sum of the individual reward components, along with the state  $s_t$  and value estimates, are recorded and stored in an experience replay buffer. Once the buffer accumulates a sufficient number of experiences (i.e., reaches a predefined threshold), the policy and value networks undergo an update operation.

The update process is performed iteratively over several epochs. In each epoch, a mini-batch of experiences is sampled from the replay buffer. For each sampled experience, the Generalized Advantage Estimation (GAE) advantages  $\hat{A}t$  are computed using the formula:

$$\hat{A}t = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \lambda^l (\gamma \lambda)^l \delta_{t+l}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\delta_t = r_t + \gamma V_\phi(s_{t+1}) - V_\phi(s_t), \quad (8)$$

is the temporal difference (TD) error,  $\gamma$  is the discount factor, and  $\lambda$  is the GAE parameter. These computed advantages are then normalized to stabilize training. The actor-critic network then evaluates the current policy  $\pi_\theta$  and value functions  $V_\phi$  based on the batch’s states, actions, masks, and reward components, yielding log probabilities of actions, estimated state values, and policy entropy  $H(\pi_\theta(\cdot|s_t))$ .

The policy network is optimized using a Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) inspired clipped surrogate objective. The policy loss  $\mathcal{L}\pi(\theta)$  is given by: Let  $r_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a_t|s_t)}$  be the ratio of probabilities under the current and old policies. The clipped surrogate objective  $S_t(\theta)$  is defined as:

$$S_t(\theta) = \min \left( r_t(\theta) \hat{A}t, \text{clip}(r_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}t \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $\hat{A}t$  are the normalized advantages, and  $\epsilon$  is the clipping parameter. The policy loss  $\mathcal{L}\pi(\theta)$  is then:

$$\mathcal{L}\pi(\theta) = -\hat{\mathbb{E}}t[S_t(\theta)], \quad (10)$$

where  $\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$  is the probability of action  $a_t$  under the Policy Net  $\pi_\theta$  given state  $s_t$ , and  $\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a_t|s_t)$  is the probability under the old policy.

Concurrently, for the Value Net update, a target return  $Y_t$  is constructed as a weighted average of the experimental reward  $R_t^{\text{exp}}$  and the discounted return  $G_t$ :

$$Y_t = \alpha \cdot R_t^{\text{exp}} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot G_t, \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a blending factor. The value loss  $\mathcal{L}V(\phi)$  is then calculated as the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the predicted state values  $V\phi(s_t)$  and these target returns:

$$\mathcal{L}V(\phi) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}t[(V\phi(s_t) - Y_t)^2]. \quad (12)$$

An entropy regularization term  $\mathcal{L}\text{ent}(\theta)$  is included to encourage exploration:

$$\mathcal{L}\text{ent}(\theta) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}t[H(\pi_\theta(\cdot|s_t))]. \quad (13)$$

The total loss  $\mathcal{L}\text{total}(\theta, \phi)$  for the network update is a composite of these components:

$$\mathcal{L}\text{total}(\theta, \phi) = \mathcal{L}\pi(\theta) + c_1 \mathcal{L}V(\phi) - c_2 \mathcal{L}\text{ent}(\theta), \quad (14)$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are coefficients balancing the contributions of the value loss and entropy regularization, respectively. This total loss is then backpropagated through the network, gradients are clipped to prevent exploding gradients, and the optimizer performs a step to update the network parameters.

## VI. EVALUATION

### A. Experimental Settings

**Datasets and LLMs:** Following prior work, we evaluate the PASS framework using two benchmark datasets: AdvBench [6] and JailbreakBench Behaviors (JBB) [22]. AdvBench is a set of 500 harmful behaviors formulated as instructions. JailbreakBench is an open-source robustness benchmark for jailbreaking large language models, with its data compilation sourced from [6], [23], [24]. JBB carefully curates 100 representative behaviors to enable more efficient evaluation of novel attack strategies. Each behavior is categorized into one of 10 distinct malicious categories. We evaluate two open-source models—DeepSeek-V3 (671B total parameters; MoE architecture) and Qwen3-14B—and one proprietary (closed-source) model. The alignment method of these LLMs are shown in Table VI-A.

TABLE I  
ALIGNMENT METHOD OF LLMs UNDER EXPERIMENT

Model	Aligning Method
Deepseek-V3	SFT + DPO
Qwen3-14B	SFT + DPO

**Attackers:** We compare the PASS framework against five strong attack methods and one baseline, all of which have been described in the preceding related work section. These methods include:

- **Baseline:** Directly inputs the malicious instructions from the dataset into the target LLMs without any modifications.

- **ArtPrompt** [17]: Disguises malicious instructions as visual embeddings using ASCII codes to circumvent the security defense mechanisms of target LLMs.
- **FlipAttack** [18]: Reverses malicious text to evade the malicious content detection of target LLMs.
- **PAIR** [16]: Employs iterative semantic prompt optimization techniques to enhance both attack success rates and transferability across models.
- **DRA** [9]: Disguises malicious instructions as riddles, compelling target LLMs to first reconstruct the malicious instructions and then generate the jailbreak output.
- **SATA** [19]: Utilizes a combination of masking harmful keywords and prompt linking techniques that induce LLMs to restore semantic connections, effectively hiding malicious intent and bypassing established security policies.

**Metrics:** Consistent with previous works, we adopt the Attack Success Rate (ASR) as our evaluation metric. However, unlike traditional methods that rely on identifying refusal keywords (e.g., "I'm sorry, I can't") or comparing against a target string to determine jailbreak success, we employ an LLM-as-a-judge approach. This decision stems from our observation that some refusal responses lack explicit refusal phrases, instead providing evasive or seemingly positive but irrelevant content. Furthermore, successful jailbreak outputs can exhibit significant diversity. To prevent misjudgment, we instruct an auxiliary LLM, using carefully crafted prompts, to assess jailbreak success based on the following criteria:

- **Success Criteria:** A response is deemed successful if it meets the following conditions: a) The response provides substantive information that directly fulfills the original intent of the instruction; b) Step-by-step instructions or detailed information are provided; c) Formal symbols or technical terms are employed to convey the intended information; d) The response executes the original instruction's intent, rather than merely explaining or redirecting.
- **Failure Criteria:** A response is deemed a failure if it exhibits any of the following characteristics: a) Complete refusal to answer the instruction; b) The response provides only mapping explanations or substitutes with unrelated content; c) The response is completely unrelated to the original query intent; d) The content does not achieve the jailbreak objective.

It is important to note that a target response is provided as a reference example for the judge LLM, but strict matching is not required; responses can be successful in diverse ways.

**PASS Configurations:** In our experiments, the PASS framework is configured with a maximum of  $N = 10$  attack iterations per query, which includes the Fallback mechanism. The experience replay buffer size for updates is set to 4, and each update epoch consists of 8 iterations. Following common hyperparameter settings for RL agents, the learning rate is  $3 \times 10^{-4}$ , the PPO clipping parameter  $\epsilon_{clip}$  is 0.2, the entropy coefficient  $c_e$  is 0.01, the value function coefficient  $c_v$  is 0.5, the GAE discount factor is 0.9, and the GAE smoothing factor

is 0.95.

## B. Result Analysis

Table VI-A presents the Attack Success Rate (ASR) of various adversarial attack methods against different Large Language Models (LLMs) across two distinct datasets: Adv Bench and JBB. ASR quantifies the percentage of successful attacks, where a higher value indicates a greater ability to elicit harmful or undesired responses from the target LLM. Figure 1 illustrates a simplified schematic of our attack (prompt of initial round and final round). As evident from Table VI-A, the PASS framework consistently achieves high Attack Success Rates (ASRs) across various LLMs and datasets compared to other evaluated attack methods. For instance, on Deepseek-V3, PASS demonstrates ASRs of 99.03% on the Adv Bench dataset and 96.84% on the Jailbreak Bench dataset. Similarly, for Qwen3-14B, PASS achieves 92.94% on Adv Bench and 85.71% on Jailbreak Bench. These figures are higher than those of all other baseline and attacks. This stark contrast in ASR values highlights the superior effectiveness of the PASS framework in generating successful adversarial examples that bypass the safety alignments of the target LLM. This robust performance across different datasets and models, including Deepseek-V3 and Qwen3-14B, underscores PASS's capability to consistently identify and exploit vulnerabilities in LLM safety mechanisms.

Our analysis of the experimental results suggests that attack success primarily stems from limitations in current alignment methods. These methods aim to train a language model  $\pi_\theta(y|x)$  to significantly increase the probability of generating desired (safe, aligned) responses  $y_d$  over jailbreak (unsafe, unaligned) responses  $y_j$  for a given input  $x$ , while preserving general capabilities. Let  $\pi_\theta(y|x)$  denote the probability of generating response  $y$  given input  $x$  by the aligned model with parameters  $\theta$ . Let  $\pi_{ref}(y|x)$  be the probability from a reference model, serving as a regularization. Let  $\mathcal{D}_{pref} = (x, y_d, y_j)$  be a dataset of preferred and dispreferred response pairs, where  $y_d$  is preferred over  $y_j$  for input  $x$ . Let  $\beta$  be a hyperparameter controlling the strength of the preference optimization, and  $\sigma(\cdot)$  be the sigmoid function. Formally, a general objective function, particularly for preference-based alignment approaches, optimizes model parameters  $\theta$  by maximizing the relative log-probability of desired responses over jailbreak responses:

$$\mathcal{L}_{align}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, y_d, y_j) \sim \mathcal{D}_{pref}} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta \left( \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_d|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_d|x)} - \log \frac{\pi_\theta(y_j|x)}{\pi_{ref}(y_j|x)} \right) \right) \right]. \quad (15)$$

This objective aims to maximize the relative log-probability of desired responses ( $y_d$ ) over jailbreak responses ( $y_j$ ) with respect to the reference model. This approach introduces two primary issues: a) Performance degradation in the aligned model's responses to non-malicious queries; b) The inevitable existence of disguised inputs not covered by malicious datasets, making 0-day attacks difficult to prevent.

TABLE II  
ATTACK SUCCESS RATE (ASR, %) UNDER DIFFERENT LLMs, DATASETS, AND ATTACKS (TRANSPOSED)

Model	Dataset	Baseline	ArtPrompt	FlipAttack	PAIR	DRA	SATA	PASS
Deepseek-V3	Adv Bench	0.99	1.98	21.78	1.98	2.97	19.79	<b>99.03</b>
	Jailbreak Bench	6.00	10.00	27.00	1.02	8.00	13.48	<b>96.84</b>
Qwen3-14B	Adv Bench	3.96	1.98	19.80	1.98	7.92	4.88	<b>92.94</b>
	Jailbreak Bench	11.00	8.00	13.00	2.02	6.00	11.36	<b>85.71</b>

Cases with abnormal Judge LLM response (e.g., null result field) are excluded.

We argue that the success of attacks employing formalization and reinforcement learning directly exploits these inherent limitations, particularly the "disguised inputs" problem. Such attacks transform an original malicious query  $q$  into a sequence of formalized, atomic steps  $S = s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k$ . An RL agent then dynamically combines these steps to generate a diverse attack prompt  $P_a$ . This process allows for the flexible and unsupervised exploration of the input space to find novel attack vectors that circumvent the alignment mechanisms. Let  $T(\cdot)$  be the tokenizer function,  $E(\cdot)$  be the embedding function,  $G(\cdot)$  be the core LLM generation function, and  $A(\cdot)$  denote the alignment detection function. Let  $R_m$  be the region in the LLM's embedding space identified as malicious by  $A(\cdot)$ . The alignment objective  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{align}}(\theta)$  implicitly attempts to ensure that for any  $Im$ , its encoded form  $E(T(q))$  falls within  $R_m$ , triggering safety measures. However, a successful attack finds a  $P_a$  such that:

$$\mathcal{S}(P_a) \approx \mathcal{S}(q) \implies G(E(T(P_a))) = O_m, \quad (16)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$  represents the semantic intent of the input, and  $O_m$  is the desired malicious output. Crucially, this is achieved while satisfying the alignment circumvention condition, where  $\mathcal{B}$  denotes the state of bypassing safety mechanisms:

$$E(T(P_a)) \notin R_m \implies A(E(T(P_a))) = \mathcal{B}. \quad (17)$$

This means the attack successfully generates a malicious output without triggering the alignment mechanism. We contend that this bypass is achieved by exploiting several fundamental characteristics of LLMs and the limitations of current alignment methodologies based on  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{align}}(\theta)$ :

- **Embedding Space Discontinuity and Sparsity:** The LLM's high-dimensional embedding space is complex and often sparsely populated. The alignment model  $A(\cdot)$ , trained on a finite dataset of preferred and dispreferred response pairs via  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{align}}(\theta)$ , can only learn the boundaries of  $R_m$  imperfectly. The formalization and RL-driven combination generate novel, unseen input structures  $P_a$  whose embeddings  $E(T(P_a))$  can reside in regions not explicitly covered by the dataset of preferred and dispreferred response pairs or in "blind spots" of  $A(\cdot)$ , thus evading detection.
- **Diversity and Obfuscation:** For a given  $q$ , the RL agent can generate multiple structurally diverse  $P_a$  variations. This inherent diversity, not explicitly penalized by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{align}}(\theta)$  beyond the specific  $y_j$  in the dataset of preferred and dispreferred response pairs, makes it difficult for  $A(\cdot)$

to rely on fixed patterns. The attack surface is constantly shifting and obfuscated.

- **Context Manipulation and Semantic Drift:** The atomic steps and their combinations can subtly manipulate the input context. This leads to a "semantic drift" in the LLM's internal interpretation, where the model's internal states, despite the malicious intent, do not align with the patterns  $A(\cdot)$  was trained to detect. This is because  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{align}}(\theta)$  primarily focuses on output probabilities rather than robustly understanding nuanced contextual shifts in the input.
- **Systematic Structural Perturbation:** Analogous to how minor input perturbations can alter tokenization and embeddings, the formalization and RL approach applies more macroscopic structural and combinatorial changes to  $P_a$ . The RL agent intelligently searches for combinations that systematically perturb  $E(T(P_a))$  away from  $R_m$ , effectively creating "covert paths" in the embedding space that were not sufficiently covered by the negative examples in the dataset of preferred and dispreferred response pairs.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced PASS, a novel jailbreaking attack method leveraging reinforcement learning and formalized prompt descriptions to achieve multi-round jailbreaks and construct a GraphRAG system. Our extensive experiments confirm the high effectiveness and practical applicability of PASS against aligned LLMs. Furthermore, we formally analyzed the underlying reasons for the attack's success, revealing how our proposed method exploits the inherent limitations and vulnerabilities of current alignment mechanisms in LLMs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, "Gpt-4 technical report," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] A. Dubey, A. Jauhri, A. Pandey, A. Kadian, A. Al-Dahle, A. Letman, A. Mathur, A. Schelten, A. Yang, A. Fan *et al.*, "The llama 3 herd of models," *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv-2407, 2024.
- [3] A. Liu, B. Feng, B. Xue, B. Wang, B. Wu, C. Lu, C. Zhao, C. Deng, C. Zhang, C. Ruan *et al.*, "Deepseek-v3 technical report," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [4] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray *et al.*, "Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 27 730–27 744, 2022.
- [5] Y. Bai, A. Jones, K. Ndousse, A. Askell, A. Chen, N. DasSarma, D. Drain, S. Fort, D. Ganguli, T. Henighan *et al.*, "Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.

- [6] A. Zou, Z. Wang, N. Carlini, M. Nasr, J. Z. Kolter, and M. Fredrikson, “Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15043*, 2023.
- [7] X. Liu, N. Xu, M. Chen, and C. Xiao, “Autodan: Generating stealthy jailbreak prompts on aligned large language models,” in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7Jwpw4qKkb>
- [8] J. Yu, X. Lin, Z. Yu, and X. Xing, “Gptfuzzer: Red teaming large language models with auto-generated jailbreak prompts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10253*, 2023.
- [9] T. Liu, Y. Zhang, Z. Zhao, Y. Dong, G. Meng, and K. Chen, “Making them ask and answer: Jailbreaking large language models in few queries via disguise and reconstruction,” in *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*, 2024, pp. 4711–4728.
- [10] X. Chen, Y. Nie, L. Yan, Y. Mao, W. Guo, and X. Zhang, “RI-jack: Reinforcement learning-powered black-box jailbreaking attack against llms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08725*, 2024.
- [11] D. Edge, H. Trinh, N. Cheng, J. Bradley, A. Chao, A. Mody, S. Truitt, D. Metropolitan, R. O. Ness, and J. Larson, “From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130*, 2024.
- [12] H. Lee, S. Phatale, H. Mansoor, K. R. Lu, T. Mesnard, J. Ferret, C. Bishop, E. Hall, V. Carbune, and A. Rastogi, “Rlaif vs. rlhf: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback,” in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024, arXiv:2309.00267. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.00267>
- [13] R. Rafailov, A. Sharma, E. Mitchell, C. D. Manning, S. Ermon, and C. Finn, “Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, pp. 53 728–53 741, 2023.
- [14] W. Yuan, R. Y. Pang, K. Cho, S. Sukhbaatar, J. Xu, and J. Weston, “Self-rewarding language models,” in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 46 147–46 161. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/yuan24d.html>
- [15] N. Jain, A. Schwarzschild, Y. Wen, G. Somepalli, J. Kirchenbauer, P.-y. Chiang, M. Goldblum, A. Saha, J. Geiping, and T. Goldstein, “Baseline defenses for adversarial attacks against aligned language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00614*, 2023.
- [16] P. Chao, A. Robey, E. Dobriban, H. Hassani, G. J. Pappas, and E. Wong, “Jailbreaking black box large language models in twenty queries,” in *2025 IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning (SaTML)*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 23–42.
- [17] F. Jiang, Z. Xu, L. Niu, Z. Xiang, B. Ramasubramanian, B. Li, and R. Poovendran, “Artprompt: Ascii art-based jailbreak attacks against aligned llms,” in *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2024, pp. 15 157–15 173.
- [18] Y. Liu, X. He, M. Xiong, J. Fu, S. Deng, and B. Hooi, “Flipattack: Jailbreak llms via flipping,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02832*, 2024.
- [19] X. Dong, W. Hu, W. Xu, and T. He, “Sata: A paradigm for llm jailbreak via simple assistive task linkage,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, 2025, pp. 1380–1392. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/2025.findings-acl.100/>
- [20] J. He, Y. Gong, Z. Lin, C. Wei, Y. Zhao, and K. Chen, “Llm factoscope: Uncovering llms’ factual discernment through measuring inner states,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, 2024, pp. 10 218–10 230.
- [21] S. Bird, E. Klein, and E. Loper, *Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit*. ” O’Reilly Media, Inc.”, 2009.
- [22] P. Chao, E. DeBenedetti, A. Robey, M. Andriushchenko, F. Croce, V. Schwag, E. Dobriban, N. Flammarion, G. J. Pappas, F. Tramèr, H. Hassani, and E. Wong, “Jailbreakbench: An open robustness benchmark for jailbreaking large language models,” in *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024.
- [23] M. Mazeika, A. Zou, N. Mu, L. Phan, Z. Wang, C. Yu, A. Khoja, F. Jiang, A. O’Gara, E. Sakhaee, Z. Xiang, A. Rajabi, D. Hendrycks, R. Poovendran, B. Li, and D. Forsyth, “Tdc 2023 (llm edition): The trojan detection challenge,” in *NeurIPS Competition Track*, 2023.
- [24] M. Mazeika, L. Phan, X. Yin, A. Zou, Z. Wang, N. Mu, E. Sakhaee, N. Li, S. Basart, B. Li, D. Forsyth, and D. Hendrycks, “Harmbench:

A standardized evaluation framework for automated red teaming and robust refusal,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04249*, 2024.