

# DivQAT: Enhancing Robustness of Quantized Convolutional Neural Networks against Model Extraction Attacks

Kacem Khaled, Felipe Gohring de Magalhães and Gabriela Niculescu  
*Polytechnique Montréal, Canada*

**Abstract**—Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and their quantized counterparts are vulnerable to extraction attacks, posing a significant threat of IP theft. Yet, the robustness of quantized models against these attacks is little studied compared to large models. Previous defenses propose to inject calculated noise into the prediction probabilities. However, these defenses are limited since they are not incorporated during the model design and are only added as an afterthought after training. Additionally, most defense techniques are computationally expensive and often have unrealistic assumptions about the victim model that are not feasible in edge device implementations and do not apply to quantized models. In this paper, we propose *DivQAT*, a novel algorithm to train quantized CNNs based on Quantization Aware Training (QAT) aiming to enhance their robustness against extraction attacks. To the best of our knowledge, our technique is the first to modify the quantization process to integrate a model extraction defense into the training process. Through empirical validation on benchmark vision datasets, we demonstrate the efficacy of our technique in defending against model extraction attacks without compromising model accuracy. Furthermore, combining our quantization technique with other defense mechanisms improves their effectiveness compared to traditional QAT.

**Index Terms**—Machine Learning, Quantization, Security, Model extraction attacks.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In modern computing, the development of Deep Learning (DL) models has resulted in a new era of innovation and technological advancement. These models, trained on vast datasets, have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across many tasks, from image recognition to natural language processing [1], [2]. As the demand for intelligent systems continues to grow, there is a pressing need for deploying DL models on edge devices, such as smartphones, and IoT devices, to enable real-time inference and decision-making in embedded systems.

Deploying DL models on edge devices presents unique challenges, particularly in terms of computational resources, memory constraints, and energy efficiency. To address these challenges, researchers propose to compress DL models without significantly affecting their performance using techniques such as *pruning* and *quantization*: the former relies on reducing redundant and non-informative neurons [3], [4], and the latter reduces the number of bits required to represent

This research was funded by Synopsys Inc. and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

Preprint under review.




Fig. 1. In model extraction attacks, the adversary leverages the prediction probabilities of their inputs to build a labeled dataset. Then the attacker uses this dataset to train their stolen model.

the model weights [5], [6]. Quantization generally outperforms pruning due to its predictable memory savings and efficiency [7]. By reducing the precision of model parameters, quantization techniques effectively lower the computational costs and memory footprint of DL models, making them more suitable for deployment on edge devices [8].

The widespread adoption of DL techniques has raised concerns about their security and privacy [9]. Particularly, in model extraction attacks, also called as model stealing attacks, adversaries can exploit the output predictions of a deployed model to extract a surrogate model. Fig. 1 illustrates the process of an extraction attack to steal a vision model. Even in a black-box setting, by observing the input-output pairs, the attacker can build a labeled dataset to train a surrogate Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) with high accuracy and fidelity to the victim, posing a significant risk of Intellectual Property (IP) theft [10]. Extraction attacks are less studied in the literature than adversarial attacks since the latter have a direct impact on deteriorating the model's performance. Adversarial attacks focus on crafting adversarial examples to evade the classification or fool a model [11]. However, extraction attacks are not of less importance since they may serve as a stepping stone to adversarial attacks and make them easier. An adversary could leverage the extracted model as a substitute victim to craft adversarial examples transferable to the original victim [12]. Hence, defending against extraction attacks makes other attacks more difficult.

State-of-the-art defenses against model extraction attacks still have multiple limitations. Firstly, they do not modify

the training algorithm to integrate the defense into training. In contrast to adversarial training [13], which was introduced to create models robust by design against adversarial examples, defenses against extraction attacks are still added as an afterthought to the models. The key idea of state-of-the-art defenses against model extraction attacks on computer vision models is often to inject noise into prediction probabilities [14]–[18]. While effective to some extent, some of these defenses are computationally expensive and may not be feasible for real-time and edge implementations due to resource constraints and induced significant delays in inference time [14], [15]. This prevents their integration into quantized models. Other defenses preserve the model inference time and may be applied to quantized models without additional training [17], [18]. Yet, none of them have been customized for quantized models [17], [18], nor do they focus on incorporating security into the training and design of quantized CNNs.

In this paper, we introduce *Divergence-Based Quantization Aware Training (DivQAT)*, a novel approach that addresses the vulnerabilities of quantized models to model extraction attacks. DivQAT is a technique designed to enhance the robustness of quantized models against stealing attacks on CNNs. Unlike previous methods that add defenses as an afterthought, DivQAT integrates a model extraction defense directly into the Quantization Aware Training (QAT) process. Our approach introduces a divergence loss term during QAT, increasing the dissimilarity between the prediction probability distributions of the original and quantized models. During quantization, instead of minimizing the cross-entropy loss of the quantized model with relation to the true labels, we additionally maximize the KL-divergence loss between the quantized and the original model predictions. KL-divergence can be used to maximize the similarity between two models [19], thus our rationale, is that maximizing this loss would help deviate probabilities of the quantized model from the same distribution as the large one. By manipulating this divergence, we slightly poison prediction probabilities that are crucial for adversaries attempting model extraction, thus strengthening the robustness of quantized models without compromising their accuracy.

Through extensive experimentation, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our technique in enhancing the robustness of quantized models against extraction attacks, while preserving the accuracy. Besides, we combine DivQAT with efficient state-of-the-art defenses that can be applied in quantized models and find that our training approach improves their performance. To summarize, we make the following contributions:

- we propose a novel approach to QAT, which aims to enhance the robustness of quantized models against model extraction attacks. To the best of our knowledge, our technique DivQAT is the first to modify the quantization process to integrate a model extraction defense directly into the training phase;
- through empirical validation on benchmark vision datasets and against state-of-the-art attacks, we demonstrate the efficacy of our technique in mitigating the risks posed by model extraction attacks, without compromising the accuracy of the model, and;

- when combined with other post-training defense mechanisms, our quantization technique, DivQAT, improves their effectiveness compared to traditional QAT, providing an additional layer of security for edge devices deploying quantized models.

In the remainder of this paper, we provide an overview of the background and related work in Section II, we delve into the methodology behind our proposed divergence-based quantization technique in Section III, we present and discuss the experimental results in Section IV, and finally, we conclude the paper in Section V.

## II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

In this section, we introduce the background and basic concepts to Machine Learning (ML) and the quantization of CNNs mentioned in our work. Then, we review the related work to model extraction attacks and defenses.

### A. Machine Learning (ML)

ML algorithms are computational methods that learn from data to perform specific tasks [20]. This data comprises examples with quantitatively measured features, each represented as a vector in a multi-dimensional space.

DL, a subset of ML, involves techniques based on Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) [20]. DL models map input vectors to output values through multiple layers of interconnected neurons. These models are trained by optimizing their parameters to minimize a loss function, typically using methods like Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) [20]. SGD is an iterative optimization method commonly used for minimizing a cost function in ML models. During training, SGD processes one training example (or a small batch) at a time. It updates the model parameters by taking a step in the direction of the negative gradient of the cost function. The learning rate controls the step size during parameter updates. The loss function (often denoted as  $\mathcal{L}$ ) quantifies the difference between the predicted values and the actual labels. For instance, the cross-entropy loss equation is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE}(y, f_W(x)) = - \sum_i y_i \log f_W(x_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $y_i$  is the actual label for the  $i$ -th example,  $f_W(x_i)$  is the predicted value (i.e., the output of the model) for the  $i$ -th example and  $W$  represents the model parameters. In each iteration of SGD, the gradient of the loss function with respect to the model parameters is computed, and the parameters are updated accordingly. The process repeats for a specified number of iterations or until convergence.

*Generative models* are a class of ML models designed to create new data samples that resemble a given dataset. They learn the underlying patterns and generate novel instances. Popular examples include Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) [21] and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [22].

*Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)* are a specific type of DL models that are particularly suitable for tasks involving images. The input to a CNN is typically an image, and

the features are the individual pixels of the image. CNNs use convolution operations and non-linear activations to learn filters and characteristics relevant to the task [23]. These filters can capture local patterns, like edges and shapes, in the input image. After sufficient training, CNNs can learn high-level features in images that are useful for tasks such as image classification. This makes CNNs highly effective for computer vision tasks.

### B. Quantization of CNNs

Quantization is a fundamental technique used to reduce the computational and memory requirements of DL models, particularly when deploying them on resource-constrained devices such as edge devices [5], [6]. In the context of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), quantization involves reducing the precision of the model parameters, such as weights and activations, from floating-point numbers to lower bit-width integers [24]. Quantization techniques fall into two families: Post Training Quantization (PTQ) and Quantization Aware Training (QAT) [8].

PTQ is a commonly used approach where quantization is applied after the model has been trained using full precision (usually 32-bit floating-point numbers). In PTQ, the model is first trained using standard techniques, and then the weights and activations are quantized to lower precision (e.g., 8-bit integers) during inference. While PTQ is straightforward to implement and is effective in reducing model size and inference latency, it may suffer from accuracy degradation due to quantization-induced errors [8].

QAT, on the other hand, integrates the quantization process into the training pipeline. During QAT, the model is trained with quantization in mind, simulating the lower precision arithmetic that will be used during inference [25]. This allows the model to adapt to the quantization effects, often resulting in a quantized model that closely approximates the accuracy of the original full-precision model. QAT involves additional training for a pre-trained model with quantization constraints, which requires additional computational resources and time compared to PTQ but can yield superior performance on quantized models [8].

### C. Model stealing attacks

Model extraction attacks on DL models, also known as model stealing attacks, pose a significant threat to the IP of ML model owners. These attacks occur during the inference phase, even in black-box settings, where an adversary can observe the prediction outputs of their queries to a model and attempt to replicate its functionality or parameters [10]. The goal is to create a classifier that matches or closely approximates the target classifier, which not only risks the IP but also facilitates other attacks like membership inference [26] and evasion attacks [27].

Model stealing attacks are categorized into two types: side-channel extraction attacks (leveraging hardware side-channel information) [28]–[31] and API-based extraction attacks (exploiting input-output predictions through APIs) [10], [12],

[32]–[42]. In this paper, we focus on stealing attacks that leverage API access.

Earlier work [12] introduces a method to generate synthetic data using Jacobian-based data augmentation techniques. Then using this data they query the target model. They use the stolen model to craft adversarial examples [43] to evade the classification of the victim model. An intriguing attack, known as *KnockoffNets* [32], aims to create a functionally equivalent clone of CNNs using random and publicly available data. Despite its simplicity, KnockoffNets outperforms other state-of-the-art stealing attacks.

Recent advancements in extraction attacks against CNNs include *MAZE* [39] and *DFME* [40]. These approaches leverage generative models for building the adversary's dataset, without relying on public datasets. They generate query images while observing the output predictions of the victim model to target the decision boundary better. They achieve successful extraction for most cases, albeit at the cost of requiring millions of queries compared to KnockoffNets.

Other stealing attacks in the literature assume that a target model can only output top-1 predictions (hard labels) instead of probability values [41], [42]. This could limit the amount of information that can be obtained about the model's confidence in its predictions. In our work, we only consider attacks leveraging soft labels with full access to output probabilities.

### D. Model stealing defenses

To protect models against API-based model stealing attacks, researchers propose to add perturbation to the prediction probabilities [14]–[18]. Since the adversary relies on these predictions to build a labeled dataset, the defender aims to poison the attacker's training data with perturbed annotations.

The *Reverse Sigmoid (RS)* defense [17] proposes to change the activation function of the last layer of a Neural Network (NN) to a reverse sigmoid to perturb the output predictions. However, the transparency of the model is negatively affected by using such a high perturbation level in this technique. Another method includes truncating the probability scores [32] but it is ineffective against state-of-the-art attackers due to its simplicity. Additionally, adding random noise is explored [32] but is considered a bad strategy as it compromises the defender's performance due to large perturbation levels. Some defenses propose monitoring the input queries to detect an ongoing attack by identifying a deviation from the normal distribution [44] or a high volume of Out-of-Distribution (OOD) queries [16]. In *Adaptive Misinformation (AM)* [16] defense, queries with low prediction scores are marked as OOD, and using an auxiliary model, a high noise is injected into the predictions. Nevertheless, this method is susceptible to false positives, which deteriorates the model's performance.

Recent works [14], [15] propose to compute the appropriate perturbation level per query relying on optimization methods. *MAD* [14] is a defense that attempts to solve an optimization problem where it mimics the attacker by using a different network and tries to add the perturbation that maximizes the error of the simulated surrogate model. It aims to deviate the adversary's gradient signal by injecting targeted noise into the

TABLE I  
OUR APPROACH VS. STATE-OF-THE ART METHODS DEFENDING AGAINST EXTRATION ATTACKS

Approach	Fast inference	No auxiliary model	Low perturbation	Integrated in training
MAD [14]	✗	✗	✓	✗
GRAD <sup>2</sup> [15]	✗	✗	✓	✗
AM [16]	✓	✗	✓	✗
RS [17]	✓	✓	✗	✗
DCP [18]	✓	✓	✓	✗
DivQAT	✓	✓	✓	✓

prediction probabilities. However, computing these perturbations is computationally expensive and delays the inference latency. *GRAD<sup>2</sup>* [15] is a method similar to MAD, focusing on redirecting the gradient signal. It suggests simulating the attacker’s knowledge by training a surrogate model using the attacker’s queries. However, *GRAD<sup>2</sup>* assumes that the attacker will send a large batch of queries for training the simulated attacker, which limits its practicality. This is because it presumes that the system where the model is deployed for predictions has enough hardware resources for the training.

*Deception (DCP)* [18] is a heuristic defense that perturbs output probabilities without additional training nor relying on an auxiliary model. Their technique is inspired by the defenses RS and AM, but it achieves better trade-offs between the defender’s accuracy and the perturbation level while maintaining low inference latency. The authors demonstrated the effectiveness of their defense on large CNNs and their quantized counterparts. However, DCP does not modify the quantization process but rather uses a simple heuristic function to compute the noise that can be injected at the last layer of a model during inference.

To summarize, current strategies to defend against model extraction attacks on computer vision models typically involve adding noise to predictions. However, none of these defenses [14]–[18] are tailored for quantized models, nor do they explore integrating security into the training and design of quantized CNNs (Table I). Additionally, some of these strategies [14], [15] are computationally demanding and may not be suitable for real-time and edge deployments due to resource limitations and significant inference time delays.

### III. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we present the threat model assumptions. Then, we describe our approach DivQAT, the validation process in our methodology, and the evaluation metrics.

#### A. Threat model

After quantization, the model owner (i.e., the victim) provides an API access to users where they can send inputs (e.g., images) and receive output probabilities (e.g., 90% being a vehicle). We consider a scenario where the attacker has API access to the victim’s quantized model, akin to a benign user’s interaction. The attacker lacks direct access to the model’s architecture, training data, or parameters. Despite these limitations, model stealing attacks remain feasible through the

observation of input-output pairs [32]. The attacker’s objective is to replicate the victim model’s functionality closely.

#### B. Approach

Our approach focuses on disrupting the output probabilities that API-based model stealing attacks typically exploit. We propose an alteration to the QAT process, aiming to produce a quantized model that, while maintaining accuracy, yields probabilities divergent from the original model. We introduce *DivQAT*: a divergence-based QAT algorithm. This divergence introduces noise into the attacker’s dataset, hindering their ability to replicate the model effectively.

We implement our approach by integrating a divergence-based loss term into the QAT process. Figure 2 describes the steps of our algorithm. To illustrate, let  $f_{W_L}$  represent a large (i.e., non-quantized) model trained with a dataset  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $f_{W_Q}$  denote its quantized counterpart, with  $W_L$  and  $W_Q$  being their respective parameters. Let  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  denote a training example and its ground truth label. In a normal quantization process, the quantized network is trained by minimizing cross-entropy loss, defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE}(y, f_{W_Q}(x)) = - \sum_i y_i \log f_{W_Q}(x_i) \quad (2)$$

Our proposed methodology modifies the loss function by incorporating a divergence term, specifically the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence [45]. We modify the loss to minimize the cross-entropy loss of the quantized model and to maximize the KL-divergence between the large and the quantized model. Contrary to previous work that used KL-divergence as a mean to maximize the similarity between two models while transferring the knowledge between them [19], [39], our rationale is that using this loss would help deviate probabilities of the quantized model from the same distribution as the large one. For example, in knowledge distillation [19], where knowledge is transferred from a large network to a smaller one, both the cross-entropy loss and the KL-divergence are minimized. Furthermore, extraction attacks such as MAZE [39] leverage minimizing the KL-divergence while training the stolen model, to have a surrogate model that closely mimics the victim.

In our DivQAT algorithm, we seek to have a quantized model that does not imitate the decision boundary of the original model but rather have a more generalized one that makes it harder to extract knowledge from. During quantization, when computing the KL-divergence loss in each training epoch, we additionally feed the training examples to the large model and get their predictions. The large model and the quantized model predictions are respectively denoted as  $f_{W_L}(x_i)$  and  $f_{W_Q}(x_i)$  for an input  $x_i$ . Then, the KL-divergence is calculated as follows:

$$D_{KL}(f_{W_Q}(x) \parallel f_{W_L}(x)) = \sum_i f_{W_Q}(x_i) \log \frac{f_{W_Q}(x_i)}{f_{W_L}(x_i)} \quad (3)$$

Consequently, our proposed loss function becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(y, f_{W_Q}, f_{W_L}) = & \mathcal{L}_{CE}(y, f_{W_Q}(x)) \\ & - \alpha D_{KL}(f_{W_Q}(x) \parallel f_{W_L}(x)) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$




Fig. 2. Our Div-QAT approach: First, we initialize a quantized neural network based on a trained non-quantized model (red dashed arrow). Then, the quantized model is trained on the same training dataset as the original model. In each training step, input images are fed to the quantized model (forward pass) to provide prediction probabilities which will be used along with the true labels to compute the cross-entropy loss (green arrows). Additionally, we feed the training examples to the original (non-quantized) model and get their predictions to compute the KL-divergence between them and the quantized model's predictions (blue bold arrows). After that, the loss (Eq. 4) is computed. The quantized neural network weights are updated through backpropagation and the training process continues.

Here,  $\alpha$  is a hyperparameter that we add to balance between the cross-entropy loss and the KL-Divergence loss and hence it controls the trade-off between accuracy and robustness against model extraction. The training relies on minimizing the loss function, thus a negative KL-divergence term would push the model to maximize the divergence between the probability distributions while minimizing the cross-entropy loss to maintain the accuracy.

### C. Validation

Validating our approach, we seek to answer multiple research questions:

- Does our quantization algorithm enhance the robustness of quantized models against extraction attack?
- How does the robustness of models obtained through DivQAT compare to other quantized models and baseline defenses applicable to quantized models?
- What is the impact of combining our quantization algorithm with other defenses?
- Does DivQAT work on different quantization configurations?

We use several model stealing attacks to validate the robustness of quantized CNNs obtained by our algorithm *DivQAT*. We perform traditional stealing attacks that rely on publicly available datasets to query the model namely KnockoffNets [32]. Additionally, we leverage data-free stealing attacks that utilize generative models to synthesize data, namely DFME [40] and MAZE [39].

We compare the robustness of models obtained through *DivQAT* with the original *large* model, quantized models obtained through *QAT* and *PTQ* as well as other defenses. To the best of our knowledge, the state-of-the-art defenses

that are suitable for edge device implementations on quantized models are: *DCP* [18], and *RS* [17]. These defenses maintain the inference time without requiring additional models.

Then, we evaluate the impact of our quantization algorithm on other post-training defenses against stealing attacks. In this validation step, we train models using DivQAT and QAT. Then, after applying DCP and RS defenses to models obtained through both quantization algorithms, we evaluate their robustness against stealing attacks.

Finally, we test our approach on different variations of *QAT*. The quantization algorithm can be adapted depending on the target device which will be used during inference: *mobile* or *server*. We quantize models using both configurations, then we validate their robustness against extraction attacks.

### D. Evaluation metrics

The performance of defenses against stealing attacks is measured through the adversary model's prediction results on the victim's test data. To estimate how well a stolen adversary model performs on the same task as the victim, we follow previous work in this research area [15], [17], [18] and compute the *Adversary's classification error*. This metric measures the stolen functionality from the victim, i.e., the performance of the extracted model on the same task. Furthermore, to estimate the fidelity of the predictions of the adversary model to the victim, we compute the *Disagreement* between them. This metric is obtained by calculating the fraction of mismatching predictions from the victim and the extracted model. This is similar to calculating the classification error of the extracted model using the predictions of the attacked victim as ground truth labels. A powerful adversary would have lower *Adversary's classification error* and *Disagreement*,

TABLE II  
SELECTED DATASETS IN OUR EXPERIMENTS

Dataset	Dataset size	Description	Classes	Samples
CIFAR10	Train: 60k Test: 10k	Images of animals and vehicles	10	
CIFAR100	Train: 60k Test: 10k	Diverse real-world images.	100	
SVHN	Train: 73k Test: 26k	Images of street view house numbers	10	
GTSRB	Train: 39k Test: 12k	German traffic signs dataset	43	

hence we seek to maximize both metrics to weaken the adversary and hinder the model extraction attack.

To measure the impact of our defense algorithm on the victim model, similar to [15], [18], [32], we use two utility metrics: the *Defender's classification error* and the  $\ell_1$  distance between the clean predictions and the perturbed predictions by each defense technique. The  $\ell_1$  distance metric measures the magnitude of the perturbation that impacts the prediction probabilities, i.e., it is the distance between the clean probabilities and the perturbed ones. For example, an  $\ell_1$  distance larger than 1 entails a high perturbation that might harm the model's transparency and reduce its utility when probabilities are required to be precise [18].

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we explain our experimental setup including the datasets, the neural network architectures, and the training process. Then, we show and analyze our experimental results validating our approach.

##### A. Experimental setup

1) *Victim datasets*: We leverage CNNs trained on 4 benchmark vision datasets: CIFAR-10 [46], CIFAR-100 [46], SVHN [47] and GTSRB [48]. We describe these datasets in Table II. CIFAR-10 is an image dataset of 10 classes of animals and vehicles. CIFAR-100 contains 100 classes of diverse real-world images such as objects, people, animals, fruits, and vegetables. SVHN is a dataset of 10 classes of images of house numbers taken from street views. GTSRB is a dataset of 43 classes of german traffic signs. We consider models trained on these datasets as potential victims of stealing attacks.

2) *Adversary datasets*: We utilize three stealing attacks: KnockoffNets [32], DFME [40] and MAZE [39]. An adversary that leverages the KnockoffNets [32] attack requires a publicly available dataset to perform the attack. In accordance to [15], [18], we reproduce two attack scenarios in which (a) an attacker has access to images situated close to the data distribution of the victim, but without any similar data between them, and (b) an attacker who lacks knowledge of the data distribution, thus uses OOD data for the attack. Therefore, to perform the first one, since CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 are subsets of the same distribution which is the TinyImages dataset [46], we choose images from CIFAR-10 to attack

models trained on CIFAR-100, and the opposite way around. For adversaries with limited knowledge, we opt for unrelated datasets. CIFAR-10 images are selected as adversary datasets to attack victims trained on GTSRB and SVHN. In data-free model stealing attacks DFME [40] and MAZE [39], the attacker generates the adversary dataset during the attack while querying the victim model and observing its predictions.

3) *Models architectures and training*: We select the ResNet-18 [49] architecture to train the non-quantized neural networks for 50 epochs. Quantization (i.e., QAT and DivQAT) is performed with an SGD optimizer with a momentum of 0.9 and a weight decay of  $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ . The learning rate is initialized at 0.01 and updated using a cosine annealing schedule. In KnockoffNets attack [32], we select four different CNN architectures for the adversary model: ResNet-18 [49], ResNet-34 [49], MobileNetV2 [50] and ShuffleNetV2 [51]. In this attack, we limit the query budget to 50k queries. Similar to [15], [18] in training, we use an SGD optimizer with an initial learning rate of 0.01 that is annealed with a cosine schedule. We use a Nesterov Momentum of 0.9 and a weight decay of  $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ . In data-free model stealing attacks DFME [40] and MAZE [39], we choose ResNet-34-8x as the adversary model's architecture. Similar to [40], we train each model for 200 epochs with 20M queries (i.e., generated images) using SGD with an initial learning rate of 0.1 and a weight-decay of  $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ . Furthermore, a scheduler was used to increase the learning rate by 0.3 for  $0.1 \times$ ,  $0.3 \times$ , and  $0.5 \times$  of the overall training period. We use Pytorch for all experiments including the quantization. We run our code on AlmaLinux 9 computer with 1 GPU NVIDIA Tesla P100-PCIE-12GB and 24 CPU cores Intel E5-2650 v4 Broadwell @ 2.2GHz.

##### B. Experimental results

1) *DivQAT robustness against extraction attacks*: First, we evaluate the robustness of quantized models obtained by our algorithm DivQAT compared to an extraction attack on the original *large* model and on other models obtained through quantization techniques QAT and PTQ as well as quantized models protected with post-training defenses RS [17] and DCP [18]. Table III shows the results of 3 stealing attacks KnockoffNets [32], DFME [40] and MAZE [39]. For each attack, we report the performance of the victim and the corresponding stolen model using the classification error as an evaluation metric. We aim to maximize this metric for the adversary's model (i.e., the stolen model), and keep its increase as small as possible for the defender's model (i.e., the victim). Since defenses against extraction attacks add perturbation to the prediction probabilities, this may harm the confidence values of the model. Therefore, we constrain the results of RS, DCP and DivQAT to have a budget of  $\ell_1$  distance between their predictions and ones of a model obtained through normal QAT to be lower than 0.6, which is a reasonable value to keep the noise as small as possible. This ensures the transparency of models about the precision of their probabilities.

Compared to normal QAT, our algorithm DivQAT, yields a defender's neural network with a comparable performance. In most cases, the classification error variation of victim models

TABLE III  
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF MULTIPLE STEALING ATTACKS AGAINST QUANTIZED MODELS.  
THE VARIATION BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL LARGE MODEL AND QUANTIZED MODELS IS REPORTED BETWEEN PARENTHESES.  
FOR RS, DCP AND DIVQAT, VALUES ARE SELECTED WITH  $\ell_1$  DISTANCE LOWER THAN 0.6.

Dataset	Victim Model	Defender's classification error (victim model)	Adversary's classification error (stolen model)		
			Knockoffnets Attack	DFME Attack	MAZE Attack
CIFAR10	Large	16.37	20.56	42.82	67.70
	PTQ	16.69 (+0.32)	21.17 (+0.61)	43.18 (+0.36)	74.12 (+6.42)
	QAT	15.52 (-0.85)	20.40 (-0.16)	48.74 (+5.92)	82.97 (+15.27)
	RS (QAT)	15.52 (-0.85)	21.77 (+1.20)	46.80 (+3.98)	77.61 (+9.91)
	DCP (QAT)	15.55 (-0.82)	24.21 (+3.65)	67.98 (+25.16)	72.00 (+4.30)
	DivQAT	20.03 (+3.66)	23.52 (+2.96)	69.40 (+26.58)	90.00 (+22.30)
CIFAR100	Large	39.68	63.98	85.93	93.56
	PTQ	40.25 (+0.57)	63.94 (-0.04)	85.06 (-0.87)	95.17 (+1.61)
	QAT	36.33 (-3.35)	58.52 (-5.46)	86.02 (+0.09)	97.84 (+4.28)
	RS (QAT)	36.33 (-3.35)	57.76 (-6.22)	86.88 (+0.95)	94.72 (+1.16)
	DCP (QAT)	36.35 (-3.33)	65.28 (+1.29)	87.03 (+1.10)	95.87 (+2.31)
	DivQAT	42.38 (+2.70)	65.29 (+1.30)	95.69 (+9.76)	98.20 (+4.64)
GTSRB	Large	7.73	43.90	35.97	73.30
	PTQ	7.76 (+0.03)	50.18 (+6.29)	34.87 (-1.10)	83.95 (+10.65)
	QAT	7.23 (-0.50)	50.18 (+6.29)	34.87 (-1.10)	83.95 (+10.65)
	RS (QAT)	7.23 (-0.50)	46.31 (+2.41)	36.52 (+0.55)	78.80 (+5.49)
	DCP (QAT)	7.23 (-0.50)	51.71 (+7.81)	44.58 (+8.61)	82.02 (+8.72)
	DivQAT	6.88 (-0.85)	52.03 (+8.14)	64.76 (+28.79)	93.25 (+19.95)
SVHN	Large	5.82	9.22	6.89	7.18
	PTQ	5.87 (+0.05)	9.22 (+0.00)	6.48 (-0.41)	49.90 (+42.72)
	QAT	5.78 (-0.04)	9.22 (+0.00)	6.64 (-0.25)	6.56 (-0.63)
	RS (QAT)	5.78 (-0.04)	9.52 (+0.30)	5.93 (-0.96)	32.45 (+25.27)
	DCP (QAT)	5.78 (-0.04)	18.43 (+9.21)	13.50 (+6.61)	18.04 (+10.86)
	DivQAT	9.28 (+3.46)	20.97 (+11.75)	84.06 (+77.17)	92.24 (+85.06)

is negligible with an utmost performance drop of 3.66%. Furthermore, DivQAT deteriorates the stolen model performance in all attack settings. The classification error of the adversary models is increased by 1.30% to 11.75% for KnockoffNets attacks, by 9.76% to 77.17% for DFME attacks, and by 4.64% to 85.06% for MAZE attacks. We observe that DFME and MAZE attacks are the most harmed by our defense since these attacks rely on the victim's predictions to generate suitable images that will be used to query the victim model and improve its extraction. This entails that our approach poisons the data generated by these models and hinders the adversary's learning process.

We notice that KnockoffNets is the strongest attack because in most cases it produces a stolen model with the lowest classification error. Additionally, the error increase induced by our DivQAT algorithm compared to QAT is small for KnockoffNets compared to the other attacks. We experiment with this attack further using different CNN architectures ResNet-18, ResNet-34, MobileNetV2 [50], and ShuffleNetV2 [51]. Fig. 3 shows the results of Knockoffnets attacks against quantized models. For each attack, a different adversary architecture is

selected. Our algorithm shows an increase in the adversary's classification error and the disagreement for most cases. We notice that the lightweight network MobileNetV2 often yields a higher error compared to other architectures, which proves that our quantization technique makes it harder for weak adversaries to learn from perturbed outputs compared to larger models.

2) *Impact of combining DivQAT with other defenses against extraction attacks:* We explore the scenario where a model owner using our quantization technique wants to add an extra layer of protection against extraction attacks using state-of-the-art defenses suitable for quantized models. Table IV shows the results of such a scenario where quantized models are attacked with Knockoffnets attack, the strongest attack in previous experiments. Attacks are performed against multiple variations of defended models. Each defense technique has a set of parameters that can be adjusted to balance the performance trade-off between the defender and the adversary: an increase in the adversary's classification error comes with the cost of an increase in the defender's classification error. Like previous experiments, to balance both metrics we constrain the

TABLE IV

IMPACT OF COMBINING DIVQAT WITH POST-TRAINING DEFENSES.


THE VARIATION BETWEEN THE QAT AND DIVQAT IS REPORTED  
BETWEEN PARENTHESSES.FOR RS, DCP AND DIVQAT, VALUES ARE SELECTED WITH  $\ell_1$  DISTANCE  
LOWER THAN 0.6.

Dataset	Victim Model	Defender's classification error (victim model)	Adversary's classification error (stolen model)
CIFAR10	QAT+RS	15.52	21.77
	DivQAT+RS	16.41 (+0.89)	24.27 (+2.51)
	QAT+DCP	15.55	24.21
	DivQAT+DCP	16.24 (+0.69)	26.88 (+2.67)
CIFAR100	QAT+RS	36.33	57.76
	DivQAT+RS	36.65 (+0.32)	61.25 (+3.48)
	QAT+DCP	36.35	65.28
	DivQAT+DCP	36.87 (+0.52)	69.46 (+4.18)
GTSRB	QAT+RS	7.23	46.31
	DivQAT+RS	6.88 (-0.35)	54.30 (+7.99)
	QAT+DCP	7.23	51.71
	DivQAT+DCP	6.96 (-0.27)	59.36 (+7.65)
SVHN	QAT+RS	5.78	9.52
	DivQAT+RS	6.62 (+0.84)	13.15 (+3.63)
	QAT+DCP	5.78	18.43
	DivQAT+DCP	5.57 (-0.21)	20.56 (+2.13)


models with a perturbation level measured by  $\ell_1$  distance that should not exceed 0.6. Models quantized with DivQAT show a significantly improved robustness against extraction attacks compared to models quantized with normal QAT. We observe that the *Adversary's classification error* has increased in all cases. For example, for the GTSRB dataset, the classification error is up by  $\sim 8\%$  for both DivQAT+RS and DivQAT+DCP compared to respectively QAT+RS and QAT+DCP.

We investigate the impact of each defense on the prediction probabilities. RS and DCP are perturbation-based defenses, hence their efficacy relies on noising the predictions. The defender aims to maximize the adversary's error while minimally perturbing the predictions. Table III and Table IV show the adversary's classification error with respect to a fixed budget of  $\ell_1$  distance between clean and perturbed probabilities. We observe that models trained with DivQAT algorithm show better performance compared to other quantized models and baseline defenses. This entails that when using DivQAT combined with other perturbation-based defenses, the robustness against stealing attacks is enhanced while the injected noise in the prediction probabilities is reduced.

3) *Performance of DivQAT with different quantization configurations:* Table V shows the results of KnockoffNets attack against quantized models obtained through multiple quantization techniques. For each approach QAT and DivQAT, we use two quantization variations *server* and *mobile*. The perturbation level is constrained not to exceed the  $\ell_1$  distance of 0.6. We notice that in both scenarios, models quantized using our technique DivQAT yield better robustness against



(a)



(b)

Fig. 3. Results of Knockoffnets attack using different adversary architectures to extract quantized models obtained with QAT and DivQAT. (a) and (b) respectively show the adversary's classification error and the disagreement between the victim and the adversary. Each column represents the results for a dataset. Architectures are on the x-axis.




Fig. 4. Impact of  $\alpha$  variation in DivQAT on the classification error of both the victim and the stolen model (adversary).

extraction attacks compared to QAT. This validates the efficacy of our approach in protecting quantized models while having a minor accuracy drop and minimal perturbation levels.

4) *Ablation study:* We investigate the impact of the parameter  $\alpha$  in Eq.4 on the robustness of the quantized model against extraction attacks. Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 show the results of this study. We quantize multiple models using DivQAT with

TABLE V  
EXTRACTION ATTACKS AGAINST DIFFERENT QUANTIZATION  
CONFIGURATIONS  
THE VARIATION BETWEEN QAT AND DIVQAT IS REPORTED BETWEEN  
PARENTHESES.  
FOR DIVQAT, VALUES ARE SELECTED WITH  $\ell_1$  DISTANCE LOWER THAN  
0.6.

Dataset	Victim Model	Defender's classification error (victim model)	Adversary's classification error (stolen model)
CIFAR10	QAT (server)	15.52	20.40
	DivQAT (server)	20.03 (+4.51)	23.52 (+3.12)
	QAT (mobile)	15.51	21.37
	DivQAT (mobile)	18.86 (+3.35)	24.12 (+2.76)
CIFAR100	QAT (server)	36.33	58.52
	DivQAT (server)	42.38 (+6.05)	65.29 (+6.77)
	QAT (mobile)	36.37	58.97
	DivQAT (mobile)	37.60 (+1.23)	61.88 (+2.92)
GTSRB	QAT (server)	7.23	50.18
	DivQAT (server)	6.88 (-0.35)	52.03 (+1.85)
	QAT (mobile)	7.28	51.65
	DivQAT (mobile)	6.62 (-0.67)	53.55 (+1.89)
SVHN	QAT (server)	5.78	9.22
	DivQAT (server)	9.28 (+3.50)	20.97 (+11.75)
	QAT (mobile)	5.74	9.22
	DivQAT (mobile)	9.37 (+3.63)	14.92 (+5.70)




Fig. 5. Impact of  $\alpha$  variation in DivQAT on the disagreement between the victim and the adversary.

different  $\alpha$  values, then each model is extracted using multiple CNN architectures as adversary models, namely ResNet-18, ResNet-34, MobileNetV2 [50], and ShuffleNetV2 [51]. Our experiments show that increasing  $\alpha$  results in a higher classification error for both the victim and the adversary. Additionally, for high  $\alpha$  values, the disagreement between the victim and the adversary is larger. This entails that  $\alpha$  is a trade-off parameter that balances robustness against extraction attacks and the defender's performance.

Since our quantization approach relies on maximizing the KL-divergence between the original *large* model and its *quantized* counterpart, we study the variation of the KL-Divergence




Fig. 6. Impact of  $\alpha$  variation in DivQAT on the KL-Divergence between the large and quantized model.

between both models w.r.t  $\alpha$ . Fig. 6 shows the result of this experiment. We find that increasing  $\alpha$  results in increasing the KL-Divergence between the large and quantized models. This empirically proves our intuition in Eq. 4 that through our quantization algorithm, we obtain a quantized model slightly divergent from the original one.

### C. Discussion

Our experimental results underscore the robustness of the DivQAT method against model extraction attacks, demonstrating its superiority over traditional QAT and other defenses applicable to quantized models. Notably, this enhanced security does not compromise the performance of the victim model, which only has a minor decrease in accuracy. When compared to existing quantization methods and baseline defenses, DivQAT stands out for its ability to significantly increase the adversary's classification error and the disagreement between the defender and the adversary, thereby offering a more secure model against extraction attacks. These findings open up new avenues for future research, particularly in terms of focusing on the practicality and efficiency of defense mechanisms against extraction attacks, as well as integrating these defenses during the quantization process. This also suggests revisiting quantization algorithms to create models that are robust by design.

However, it's important to acknowledge the limitations of DivQAT as it is effective against attackers that require access to prediction probabilities. In other scenarios, these prediction probabilities might not be available and the victim model only provides the top-1 class label [41], [42]. Therefore, deviating the probability distribution might not be an effective strategy against attacks that steal the model without relying on the probability values. Additionally, the scope of our paper only involves the quantization of CNNs for computer vision tasks, thus the impact of DivQAT on tasks other than image classifications (e.g., natural language processing) and its effectiveness is an area that can be explored in future research directions.

## V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper presents DivQAT, a robust QAT technique designed to protect DL models on edge devices from model extraction attacks. Our extensive experiments on benchmark vision datasets have demonstrated the effectiveness

of DivQAT in enhancing model robustness without compromising accuracy. Furthermore, DivQAT has shown potential in not only defending models against direct attacks but also in enhancing the effectiveness of other defense mechanisms, thereby providing a comprehensive, multi-layered security approach. Our approach ensures that security considerations are integrated into the model development process, rather than being an afterthought. This paper paves the way for future research into optimizing quantization techniques for improved security and efficiency in edge computing applications.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, “Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 84–90, 2017.
- [2] 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.
- [3] S. Srinivas and R. V. Babu, “Data-free parameter pruning for deep neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.06149*, 2015.
- [4] S. Han, J. Pool, J. Tran, and W. J. Dally, “Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02626*, 2015.
- [5] V. Vanhoucke, A. Senior, and M. Z. Mao, “Improving the speed of neural networks on cpus,” 2011.
- [6] S. Han, H. Mao, and W. J. Dally, “Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding,” 2016.
- [7] A. Kuzmin, M. Nagel, M. Van Baalen, A. Behboodi, and T. Blankevoort, “Pruning vs quantization: Which is better?” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [8] A. Gholami, S. Kim, Z. Dong, Z. Yao, M. W. Mahoney, and K. Keutzer, “A survey of quantization methods for efficient neural network inference,” in *Low-Power Computer Vision*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2022, pp. 291–326.
- [9] I. Goodfellow, “Defense against the dark arts: An overview of adversarial example security research and future research directions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.04169*, 2018.
- [10] F. Tramèr, F. Zhang, A. Juels, M. K. Reiter, and T. Ristenpart, “Stealing machine learning models via prediction apis,” in *25th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 16)*, 2016, pp. 601–618.
- [11] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy, “Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- [12] N. Papernot, P. McDaniel, I. Goodfellow, S. Jha, Z. B. Celik, and A. Swami, “Practical black-box attacks against machine learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Asia conference on computer and communications security*, 2017, pp. 506–519.
- [13] T. Bai, J. Luo, J. Zhao, B. Wen, and Q. Wang, “Recent advances in adversarial training for adversarial robustness,” in *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, Z.-H. Zhou, Ed. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2021, pp. 4312–4321, survey Track. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2021/591>
- [14] T. Orekondy, B. Schiele, and M. Fritz, “Prediction poisoning: Towards defenses against dnn model stealing attacks,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [15] M. Mazeika, B. Li, and D. Forsyth, “How to steer your adversary: Targeted and efficient model stealing defenses with gradient redirection,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 15241–15254.
- [16] S. Kariyappa and M. K. Qureshi, “Defending against model stealing attacks with adaptive misinformation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 770–778.
- [17] T. Lee, B. Edwards, I. Molloy, and D. Su, “Defending against neural network model stealing attacks using deceptive perturbations,” in *2019 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 43–49.
- [18] K. Khaled, M. Dhaouadi, F. G. de Magalhães, and G. Niculescu, “Efficient defense against model stealing attacks on convolutional neural networks,” in *2023 International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA)*, 2023, pp. 45–52.
- [19] G. Hinton, O. Vinyals, and J. Dean, “Distilling the knowledge in a neural network,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [20] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016, <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.
- [21] D. P. Kingma, M. Welling *et al.*, “An introduction to variational autoencoders,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 307–392, 2019.
- [22] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, “Generative adversarial networks,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 139–144, 2020.
- [23] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, “ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 84–90, 2017.
- [24] J. Wu, C. Leng, Y. Wang, Q. Hu, and J. Cheng, “Quantized convolutional neural networks for mobile devices,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [25] B. Jacob, S. Kligys, B. Chen, M. Zhu, M. Tang, A. Howard, H. Adam, and D. Kalenichenko, “Quantization and training of neural networks for efficient integer-arithmetic-only inference,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 2704–2713.
- [26] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song, and V. Shmatikov, “Membership inference attacks against machine learning models,” in *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 3–18.
- [27] N. Papernot, P. McDaniel, A. Swami, and R. Harang, “Crafting adversarial input sequences for recurrent neural networks,” in *MILCOM 2016-2016 IEEE Military Communications Conference*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 49–54.
- [28] L. Wei, B. Luo, Y. Li, Y. Liu, and Q. Xu, “I know what you see: Power side-channel attack on convolutional neural network accelerators,” in *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, ser. ACSAC ’18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 393–406. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274694.3274696>
- [29] X. Hu, L. Liang, S. Li, L. Deng, P. Zuo, Y. Ji, X. Xie, Y. Ding, C. Liu, T. Sherwood *et al.*, “Deepsniffer: A dnn model extraction framework based on learning architectural hints,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, 2020, pp. 385–399.
- [30] J. Wei, Y. Zhang, Z. Zhou, Z. Li, and M. A. Al Faruque, “Leaky DNN: Stealing Deep-Learning Model Secret with GPU Context-Switching Side-Channel,” in *Proceedings - 50th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks, DSN 2020*. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2020, pp. 125–137.
- [31] Y. Xiang, Z. Chen, Z. Chen, Z. Fang, H. Hao, J. Chen, Y. Liu, Z. Wu, Q. Xuan, and X. Yang, “Open dnn box by power side-channel attack,” *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 2717–2721, 2020.
- [32] T. Orekondy, B. Schiele, and M. Fritz, “Knockoff nets: Stealing functionality of black-box models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 4954–4963.
- [33] K. Krishna, G. S. Tomar, A. P. Parikh, N. Papernot, and M. Iyyer, “Thieves on sesame street! Model extraction of bert-based apis,” *arXiv*, 2019.
- [34] R. N. Reith, T. Schneider, and O. Tkachenko, “Efficiently stealing your machine learning models,” in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM workshop on privacy in the electronic society*, 2019, pp. 198–210.
- [35] J.-B. Truong, P. Maini, R. J. Walls, and N. Papernot, “Data-free model extraction,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 4771–4780.
- [36] S. Pal, Y. Gupta, A. Shukla, A. Kanade, S. Shevade, and V. Ganapathy, “ActiveThief: Model Extraction Using Active Learning and Unannotated Public Data,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 01, pp. 865–872, 2020.
- [37] X. Yuan, L. Ding, L. Zhang, X. Li, and D. O. Wu, “Es attack: Model stealing against deep neural networks without data hurdles,” *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, 2022.
- [38] M. Jagielski, N. Carlini, D. Berthelot, A. Kurakin, and N. Papernot, “High accuracy and high fidelity extraction of neural networks,” in *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, 2020, pp. 1345–1362.
- [39] S. Kariyappa, A. Prakash, and M. K. Qureshi, “Maze: Data-free model stealing attack using zeroth-order gradient estimation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 13814–13823.
- [40] J.-B. Truong, P. Maini, R. J. Walls, and N. Papernot, “Data-free model extraction,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 4771–4780.

- [41] M. Zhou, J. Wu, Y. Liu, S. Liu, and C. Zhu, “Dast: Data-free substitute training for adversarial attacks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- [42] S. Sanyal, S. Addepalli, and R. V. Babu, “Towards data-free model stealing in a hard label setting,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022, pp. 15 284–15 293.
- [43] C. Szegedy, W. Zaremba, I. Sutskever, J. Bruna, D. Erhan, I. Goodfellow, and R. Fergus, “Intriguing properties of neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- [44] M. Juuti, S. Szyller, S. Marchal, and N. Asokan, “Prada: protecting against dnn model stealing attacks,” in *2019 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy (EuroS&P)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 512–527.
- [45] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler, “On information and sufficiency,” *The annals of mathematical statistics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 79–86, 1951.
- [46] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images,” 2009.
- [47] Y. Netzer, T. Wang, A. Coates, A. Bissacco, B. Wu, and A. Y. Ng, “Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning,” 2011.
- [48] J. Stallkamp, M. Schlipsing, J. Salmen, and C. Igel, “The German Traffic Sign Recognition Benchmark: A multi-class classification competition,” in *IEEE International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, 2011, pp. 1453–1460.
- [49] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [50] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen, “Mobilnetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks,” in *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 4510–4520.
- [51] N. Ma, X. Zhang, H.-T. Zheng, and J. Sun, “Shufflenet v2: Practical guidelines for efficient cnn architecture design,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, September 2018.