

T2VAttack: Adversarial Attack on Text-to-Video Diffusion Models

Changzhen Li, *Student Member, IEEE*, Yuecong Min, *Member, IEEE*, Jie Zhang, *Member, IEEE*,
Zheng Yuan, *Student Member, IEEE*, Shiguang Shan, *Fellow, IEEE*, Xilin Chen, *Fellow, IEEE*,

Abstract—The rapid evolution of Text-to-Video (T2V) diffusion models has driven remarkable advancements in generating high-quality, temporally coherent videos from natural language descriptions. Despite these achievements, their vulnerability to adversarial attacks remains largely unexplored. In this paper, we introduce T2VAttack, a comprehensive study of adversarial attacks on T2V diffusion models from both semantic and temporal perspectives. Considering the inherently dynamic nature of video data, we propose two distinct attack objectives: a semantic objective to evaluate video-text alignment and a temporal objective to assess the temporal dynamics. To achieve an effective and efficient attack process, we propose two adversarial attack methods: (i) T2VAttack-S, which identifies semantically or temporally critical words in prompts and replaces them with synonyms via greedy search, and (ii) T2VAttack-I, which iteratively inserts optimized words with minimal perturbation to the prompt. By combining these objectives and strategies, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation on the adversarial robustness of several state-of-the-art T2V models, including ModelScope, CogVideoX, Open-Sora, and HunyuanVideo. Our experiments reveal that even minor prompt modifications, such as the substitution or insertion of a single word, can cause substantial degradation in semantic fidelity and temporal dynamics, highlighting critical vulnerabilities in current T2V diffusion models.

Index Terms—Adversarial attack, diffusion models, text-to-video generation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of Text-to-Video (T2V) diffusion models, capable of generating coherent and high-quality videos from textual prompts, has attracted unprecedented attention over the past two years [1]–[8]. Pioneering works such as Sora [1], CogVideoX [6] and Wan [8] have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in simulating complex worlds through minute-long video generation, exhibiting impressive spatiotemporal modeling capabilities. These advances hold transformative potential across various domains, including filmmaking, embodied intelligence, and physical world simulation. However, their rapid advancements in generative capabilities also raise serious security concerns, emphasizing the urgent need for a systematic evaluation of their adversarial robustness.

Changzhen Li and Shiguang Shan are with Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, school of Intelligent Science and Technology, China, and also with the State Key Laboratory of AI Safety, Institute of Computing Technology (ICT), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing 100190, China (e-mail: changzhen.li@vipl.ict.ac.cn; sgshan@ict.ac.cn).

Yuecong Min, Jie Zhang, Zheng Yuan, and Xilin Chen are with the State Key Laboratory of AI Safety, Institute of Computing Technology (ICT), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing 100190, China, and also with the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS), Beijing 100049, China (e-mail: zhangjie@ict.ac.cn; minyuecong@ict.ac.cn; zheng.yuan@vipl.ict.ac.cn; xlchen@ict.ac.cn).

In contrast, the adversarial robustness of Text-to-Image (T2I) diffusion models has been extensively studied [9]–[11]. For example, RIATIG [9] leverages genetic algorithms [12] to craft stealthy adversarial prompts via word-level perturbations, achieving imperceptible yet effective attacks. Similarly, QueryFreeAdv [10] demonstrates that character-level perturbations can effectively attack Stable Diffusion models through Projected Gradient Descent (PGD) [13] and greedy search [14]. These approaches pose tangible threats, especially when integrated into tools such as autocomplete plugins, which can generate seemingly natural adversarial prompts that bypass content moderation and yield harmful outputs. Despite these advances in robustness evaluation of T2I models, the emerging field of T2V generation presents unique challenges: (1) semantic vulnerability, stemming from multi-frame conditional generation that requires precise cross-modal alignment, and (2) temporal vulnerability, rooted in the complexity of modeling realistic motion dynamics. To bridge these gaps, we conduct a systematic exploration of adversarial robustness on T2V models from both semantic and temporal perspectives, with representative examples illustrated in Fig. 1.

For semantic vulnerability, prior attack methods on T2I models typically leverage image-text similarity to measure semantic deviation in generated images [10]. However, the spatiotemporal nature of video introduces more intricate features, such as motion speed and trajectory. Therefore, we introduce a **Semantic Attack Objective** to quantify the alignment between a generated video and its corresponding prompt by leveraging video-text similarity. For temporal vulnerability, video generation heavily relies on temporal cues to maintain the naturalness and coherence of motions. To exploit this property, we introduce a **Temporal Attack Objective** that leverages motion estimation techniques, such as optical flow, to evaluate motion vectors across neighboring frames. An effective temporal attack aims to induce unnatural or stagnant motion, thereby degrading the quality and realism of the generated video.

Building on these objectives, we propose **T2VAttack**, a comprehensive framework for investigating the adversarial robustness of T2V diffusion models. After analyzing four fundamental text editing operations, *i.e.*, substitution, reordering, insertion, and deletion (Table VI), we observe that deletion and reordering operations provide limited attack effectiveness. Consequently, we focus on two more effective word-level adversarial strategies: the substitution attack (**T2VAttack-S**) and the insertion attack (**T2VAttack-I**). Inspired by textual adversarial methods in Natural Language Processing (NLP) such as TextFooler [15], T2VAttack-S first identifies the most




Fig. 1. Examples of adversarial attacks on CogVideoX under semantic and temporal objectives. The first and second rows show the attack results targeting the semantic and temporal objective, respectively; the third row visualizes the corresponding optical flow magnitudes for the temporal case. Columns show videos generated from the original prompt (left), after T2VAttack-S (middle), and after T2VAttack-I (right). The examples highlight that even single-word modifications can cause significant degradation in semantic fidelity and temporal dynamics.

influential words in a prompt by measuring their importance to the attack objectives, and then replaces them with carefully chosen synonyms via a greedy search to maximize semantic or temporal discrepancies. In contrast, T2VAttack-I iteratively inserts optimized words to the prompt, subtly distorting its semantics or temporal dynamics. As quantified by our proposed objectives, both of these strategies can significantly degrade semantic fidelity and temporal dynamics while maintaining high semantic and formal similarity to the original text.

To facilitate rigorous evaluation, we construct a high-quality textual dataset that describes visually rich and highly dynamic content, leveraging manually curated prompts from VBench [16] and the rewriting capabilities of GPT-4o for T2V generation tasks. We then conduct extensive experiments on four representative T2V models, ModelScope [2], CogVideoX [6], Open-Sora [17], and HunyuanVideo [18]. Experimental results demonstrate that our attack methods achieve strong effectiveness with minimal query budget, requiring only a few dozen queries and single-word modifications. These findings reveal critical vulnerabilities: even imperceptible textual perturbations can severely disrupt T2V model outputs, highlighting urgent security risks for real-world deployment.

In summary, we present a comprehensive study on adversarial attacks of T2V models, with the main contributions as follows:

- We design tailored attack objectives for T2V generation, targeting semantic and temporal vulnerabilities.
- We propose two word-level attack methods that can significantly distort generated videos while preserving imperceptibility.
- We construct a high-quality textual dataset and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the adversarial robustness of state-of-the-art T2V models.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Text-to-Video Diffusion Models

Driven by advancements in Transformers [19], Diffusion Models [20], and Diffusion Transformers [21], text-to-video generation has seen remarkable progress [1]–[7], [17], [18]. T2V diffusion models mainly consist of three key components: a text encoder, a diffusion network, and a video decoder. The text encoder, leveraging pre-trained models such as CLIP [22], T5 [23], and Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) [24], transforms input prompts into textual embeddings that guide the video generation process. The diffusion network, often implemented with U-Net [20] or more recent DiT [21] series architectures, is the core of the generative process. It samples initial video latent representations from a Gaussian distribution and iteratively denoises the video latents into coherent video representations over multiple timesteps. Finally, the video decoder, typically a Variational Autoencoder (VAE) [25] or variants like VQ-VAE [26] and VQGAN [27], translates the denoised latent representations back into raw video data.

To generate high-quality videos, various improvements have been proposed. Early works like Make-A-Video [28] and Imagen-Video [29] demonstrate the potential of cascaded diffusion models for video synthesis. To enable multi-view synthesis, Stable Video Diffusion [30] extends pretrained text-to-image models with temporal layers and staged training for video generation. More recently, ModelScope [2], building upon Stable Diffusion, introduces spatio-temporal blocks to enhance frame consistency and motion smoothness. CogVideoX [6] utilizes a 3D VAE for spatial and temporal video compression and employs an expert transformer with adaptive LayerNorm to facilitate deep cross-modal fusion. Open-Sora [17] adopts a Spatial-Temporal Diffusion Transformer (STDiT) and a compressive 3D autoencoder to enhance efficiency and flexibility. Most notably, HunyuanVideo [18], a significant advancement with 13 billion parameters, achieves high-quality video synthesis through a combination




Fig. 2. Overview of the adversarial attack pipeline for T2V models. This pipeline illustrates the key process of two attack methods (T2VAttack-S and T2VAttack-I), two attack objectives, and the targeted T2V victim models. It systematically demonstrates how minor prompt perturbations can disrupt the fidelity and dynamics in the generated videos.

of meticulous data curation, advanced architecture, and progressive model scaling. Concurrently, commercial models such as Sora [1], Pika [31], Kling [32], and Gen-3 [33] have showcased impressive video quality with fine-grained control. In this paper, we select four state-of-the-art models, ModelScope [2], CogVideoX [6], Open-Sora [17], and HunyuanVideo [18], as our victim models for adversarial evaluation. Detailed configurations of these models are provided in Supplementary Materials A.

B. Adversarial Attack on Diffusion Models

Adversarial attacks in computer vision typically involve introducing slight perturbations to input data, causing models to yield incorrect outputs. These attacks are commonly categorized by the attacker’s knowledge (white-box attacks [13], [34], [35] vs. black-box attacks [36]–[38]) and by the target objective (targeted [34], [39] vs. untargeted attacks [40]). In NLP, adversarial attacks are further classified by the granularity of perturbations (character-level [41]–[43], word-level [15], [44]–[48], and sentence-level [49], [50]). Our work mainly focuses on word-level black-box attacks.

Specifically, adversarial attacks on diffusion models can be further categorized based on the location where perturbations are applied [51]. These include input image-based [52]–[55], text prompt-based [9]–[11], [56]–[60], and fine-tuning image-based attacks [61]–[65]. Our work is most closely related to the text prompt-based attacks, which manipulate textual prompts to induce unintended or harmful content.

Text prompt-based attacks on T2I models have been extensively studied. A major goal of these attacks is to misalign the generated image with the original prompt, often by degrading visual quality or altering content semantics. For instance, QueryFreeAdv [10] appends optimized characters to reduce embedding similarity with the original prompt, shifting the generated content without querying the whole model. SAGE [57] leverages an LLM to generate semanti-

cally natural suffixes to mislead the model generation toward unintended content. Other studies, such as RealWorldAdv [60], exploit common typographic and glyph errors as perturbations to explore real-world robustness vulnerabilities, while CharGrad [58] applies visually similar character substitutions to discreetly alter outputs. Another line of text prompt-based attacks aims to bypass safety mechanisms and generate targeted or Not-Safe-For-Work (NSFW) content. TargetedAdv [56] performs gradient-based embedding optimization to bypass keyword detectors and generate images from a specific target category. RIATIG [9] employs genetic algorithms to find imperceptible adversarial prompts that are semantically different yet produce visually similar outputs. Meanwhile, MMA-Diffusion [11] uses a multi-modal objective to bypass both text and image filters, while SneakyPrompt [59] applies reinforcement learning to efficiently discover adversarial tokens. Although these studies collectively reveal that T2I models are highly susceptible to prompt-based adversarial attacks, the adversarial robustness of T2V models remains largely unexplored.

To the best of our knowledge, only one contemporaneous work, T2V-OptJail [66], has investigated jailbreak attacks on T2V models. T2V-OptJail introduces a discrete prompt optimization framework to systematically bypass safety filters for NSFW content generation. In contrast, our work focuses on evaluating the intrinsic adversarial robustness of T2V models by targeting video-specific vulnerabilities rather than solely safety bypass. Specifically, our attack targets the temporal properties of the video itself, such as optical flow in the temporal objective and video-text similarity in the semantic objective, rather than image-text similarity used by T2V-OptJail. Furthermore, our optimization seeks to maximize semantic or temporal discrepancies under general conditions, without being limited to NSFW scenarios, which enables a broader and more systematic assessment of the intrinsic robustness of T2V models.

III. METHOD

A. Problem Formulation

Let G denote a text-to-video model that takes a textual prompt X as input and produces a video $G(X)$ expected to be semantically aligned with X . The attacker aims to construct an adversarial prompt X' such that the generated adversarial video $G(X')$ minimizes a predefined attack objective M , while ensuring that the perturbation is imperceptible and that X' remains both semantically and formally similar to X . Formally, this can be formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{X'} f(G(X')) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad g(X, X') > \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is the evaluation function measuring the attack impact on the adversarial video $G(X')$. In this work, we define two **attack objectives**: the semantic objective f_s and the temporal objective f_t . The similarity function $g(\cdot, \cdot)$ quantifies the textual similarity between X and X' , which is further decomposed into formal similarity and semantic similarity. The perturbation constraint ϵ specifies the minimum similarity threshold to ensure imperceptibility. We denote by $Q : X \rightarrow X'$ the mapping from an original prompt to its adversarial prompt, termed the **attack method**, and G represents the black-box T2V models under attack. An overview of the attack pipeline is illustrated in Figure 2.

B. Attack Objective

The attack objectives are designed to assess the quality of the generated adversarial video $G(X')$ through the evaluation function $f(\cdot)$. Given the inherently spatiotemporal nature of video data, we consider semantic and temporal objectives to comprehensively guide and assess the attack performance.

1) *Semantic Objective*: Since T2V models are expected to generate videos that are semantically aligned with the input prompt, preserving this alignment is essential for generated content to faithfully reflect the user's intent. We define the semantic objective f_s to quantify the degree of alignment between the prompt and its adversarial video, with the goal of producing videos that are semantically inconsistent or irrelevant to the original prompt. Formally, the semantic similarity between the original prompt X and the corresponding adversarial video $G(X')$ is minimized in the latent space as follows:

$$f_s = \text{sim}(E_t(X), E_v(G(X'))), \quad (2)$$

where E_t and E_v represent the text encoder and video encoder from ViCLIP [67], a model demonstrating strong zero-shot performance in video-text retrieval tasks. We employ cosine similarity $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ to measure the semantic alignment between the textual features of the prompt and the visual features of the adversarial video. By minimizing the semantic objective f_s , the attack forces the generated video to diverge from the intended meaning, even when prompt perturbations are imperceptibly small.

2) *Temporal Objective*: T2V models rely heavily on temporal dynamics to preserve temporal coherence and realistic motion, which distinguishes them from T2I models [68]. Ignoring this temporal dimension may cause the generated videos to lack natural motion or coherent scene transitions, though they appear visually consistent frame by frame. Therefore, it is essential that evaluation metrics explicitly account for temporal dynamics when assessing the adversarial robustness of T2V models. To this end, we define the temporal objective f_t to quantify the degree of motion dynamics in the generated content. Given that optical flow is the most fundamental estimation technique for measuring motion in videos, we adopt it to quantify the inter-frame temporal variations:

$$f_t = \sum_{\tau=1}^{T-1} \rho(G(X')_{\tau}, G(X')_{\tau+1}), \quad (3)$$

where $\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$ calculates the optical flow intensity between neighboring frames. We utilize a learnable optical flow estimator [69] to ensure differentiability of the entire process. Minimizing the temporal objective f_t effectively suppresses inter-frame motion, thereby degrading temporal dynamics and rendering the generated videos unnaturally static.

C. Attack Method

The goal of our method is to construct adversarial prompts X' by introducing minimal perturbations to the original prompt X , such that the objective function f is minimized while preserving semantic and formal similarity. Among the four basic text editing operations, *i.e.*, substitution, reordering, insertion, and deletion, reordering has a limited impact on attack effectiveness. Similarly, deleting non-critical words has a limited effect, while the deletion of important words violates the constraint of minimal perturbation. Therefore, we focus on two word-level adversarial attack strategies: the substitution attack (T2VAttack-S) and the insertion attack (T2VAttack-I). Both strategies are designed to ensure that adversarial prompts remain semantically consistent and formally natural, while effectively degrading the semantic fidelity or temporal dynamics of the generated videos.

1) *T2VAttack-S*: Inspired by prominent adversarial attack methods in text classification [15], we extend the substitution operation to the T2V generation task. Specifically, our method first identifies semantically or temporally critical key words in the prompt X , and then replaces them with high-similarity synonyms. This substitution aims to induce significant changes in the generated video content while keeping the modifications imperceptible. While conventional text classification methods derive attack scores from label confidence, our method computes them based on their effect on semantic or temporal objectives, with similar adjustments applied to word importance and stopping criteria. To ensure attack stealthiness, we also employ SentenceTransformer [70] for accurate textual similarity measurement and enforce a high similarity threshold.

Formally, given a prompt $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ consisting of n words, we define the importance score s_i for the word

x_i as the change in the attack objective f before and after removing x_i :

$$s_i = f(G(X)) - f(G(X_{\setminus x_i})), \quad (4)$$

where $X_{\setminus x_i}$ denotes the prompt with x_i removed, and f corresponds to either semantic objective f_s or temporal objective f_t introduced in Sect. III-B. By prioritizing key words with the highest importance scores, our method enables subtle yet effective modifications that degrade semantic fidelity or temporal dynamics while preserving semantic and formal similarity.

For each important word x_i , we retrieve a set of synonym candidates from lexical databases such as WordNet [71]. To ensure semantic and syntactic coherence in the modified prompt, we adopt a three-step filtering strategy: (1) filter out stop words, (2) select high-similarity synonyms whose similarity exceeds a threshold θ with x_i , measured by SentenceTransformer, and (3) check Part-of-Speech (POS) consistency to ensure grammatical correctness. After obtaining valid candidates, we craft a set of perturbed prompts X' by substituting x_i with each candidate and then evaluate their attack objective f . From the candidates that successfully reach an attack threshold τ (τ_s for the semantic criterion and τ_t for the temporal criterion), we select the substitution with the highest textual similarity to X to maximize stealthiness. Otherwise, if no candidate meets the threshold, the algorithm proceeds to the next most important word and repeats the previous substitution process. The entire procedure is conducted in a greedy manner and terminates when either the cumulative number of substitutions reaches the predefined word modification limit or the overall attack objective is achieved, thereby controlling the overall perturbation magnitude.

2) *T2VAttack-I*: In contrast to T2VAttack-S, which perturbs existing words in the original prompt X , T2VAttack-I introduces adversarial perturbations by prepending additional words, yielding the adversarial prompt X' . This approach subtly shifts the semantics without modifying the core syntactic structure of X . Specifically, we first randomly sample a set of candidate words $\mathbb{W}^{(1)} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{q_1}\}$ from a vocabulary (e.g., GloVe [72]) as potential first-level prefixes. Each candidate word $w_i \in \mathbb{W}^{(1)}$ is prepended to X , forming an adversarial prompt $X_i'^{(1)} = [w_i; x_{1:n}]$. We then evaluate the attack objective f for each perturbed prompt and retain the top k_1 candidates that induce the largest semantic or temporal disruption as the first-level prefixes,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^{(1)} = \text{TOP-K}_{w_i \in \mathbb{W}^{(1)}}^{k_1} (f(G([w_i; x_{1:n}]))), \quad (5)$$

where the **TOP-K** operator selects the k_1 elements from $\mathbb{W}^{(1)}$ that minimize the objective function $f(\cdot)$, identifying the most effective prefixes.

Based on each retained first-level prefix in $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}^{(1)}$, we further sample q_2 additional candidate words as the second-level prefixes and repeat the evaluation and selection process. This multi-stage strategy iteratively prepends words, progressively expanding the incremental semantic deviation and amplifying adversarial influence in the generated video. The total number of queries in the whole process is $Q = q_1 + k_1 \cdot q_2 + \dots +$

$k_{i-1} \cdot q_i$. Despite its simplicity, our experiments demonstrate that inserting even a single word with dozens of queries can induce significant deviations in the generated video content.

Although T2VAttack-I typically produces adversarial prompts that remain natural and easily understood by humans, the inserted words may also be more noticeable to detectors. To enhance the stealthiness, we propose a variant, T2VAttack-I++, which introduces character-level perturbations on the inserted prefixes. These character-level modifications include insertion, deletion, reordering, substitution, duplication, symbol replacement, and case flipping. These perturbations reduce the readability of the inserted prefixes while keeping the words in the original prompt unchanged, thereby making the modifications harder to detect by human detectors and further compromising T2V generation quality.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Dataset

Effective adversarial robustness evaluations require both powerful victim models and well-curated prompts. Although VBench [16] provides a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating video generative models, its results reveal that current models still fall short of producing fully complex and coherent videos. This limitation makes direct use of VBench suboptimal for adversarial evaluation, as low performance may obscure the true impact of attacks. To address this, we build **T2VAttackBench**, a high-quality textual dataset derived from VBench and refined with large language models like GPT-4o. Empirical evaluations with both semantic and temporal objectives, as shown in Table I, demonstrate that T2VAttackBench yields videos with better visual-language alignment and motion dynamics compared to the original VBench. The construction process for our dataset is as follows.

Prompt Expansion: We augment the VBench dataset by generating semantically and temporally various prompts using GPT-4o refinement. This process generates 200 additional textual prompts (denoted GPT-G) covering semantic or temporal dimensions.

Prompt Filtering: To ensure high-quality adversarial samples, we employ a two-step protocol, *i.e.*, Model-Centric Selection and Consensus Filtering. During Model-Centric Selection, four state-of-the-art T2V models independently rank

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT PROMPT DATASETS ON STATE-OF-THE-ART T2V MODELS UNDER SEMANTIC AND TEMPORAL METRICS. OUR PROPOSED T2VATTACKBENCH YIELDS BETTER ALIGNMENT AND DYNAMICS THAN VBENCH [16] AND GPT-4O-GENERATED PROMPTS (GPT-G).

Objective	Model	VBench	GPT-G	Ours
Semantic Objective	ModelScope	72.6	72.2	81.1
	CogVideoX	65.5	71.4	79.8
	Open-Sora	68.4	70.7	80.1
	HunyuanVideo	73.6	76.8	83.0
Temporal Objective	ModelScope	34.0	20.8	45.2
	CogVideoX	46.8	45.8	83.6
	Open-Sora	47.7	24.8	67.9
	HunyuanVideo	66.3	48.5	72.1

TABLE II

ATTACK PERFORMANCE ON T2V MODELS. COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC AND TEMPORAL ATTACKS USING T2VATTACK-S, T2VATTACK-I, AND T2VATTACK-I++ ACROSS FOUR VICTIM MODELS (MODELSCOPE, COGVIDEOX, OPEN-SORA, AND HUNYUANVIDEO). METRICS INCLUDE PRE-ATTACK AND POST-ATTACK OBJECTIVE SCORES, ATTACK EFFICACY (SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE OR TEMPORAL DIFFERENCE), SEMANTIC SIMILARITY, AND FORMAL SIMILARITY. **BOLD** INDICATES THE MOST EFFECTIVE ATTACK AMONG THE THREE STRATEGIES FOR EACH MODEL.

Attack Method	Victim Models	Semantic Similarity	Formal Similarity	Pre-Attack Score	Post-Attack Score	Difference
Semantic Attack						Semantic Difference
T2VAttack-S	ModelScope	0.81	0.78	81.1	56.7	24.4 (↓30.1%)
	CogVideoX	0.84	0.79	79.8	52.7	27.1 (↓34.0%)
	Open-Sora	0.82	0.78	80.1	54.5	25.6 (↓32.0%)
	HunyuanVideo	0.82	0.78	83.0	58.8	24.2 (↓29.2%)
T2VAttack-I	ModelScope	0.89	0.91	81.1	56.0	25.1 (↓30.9%)
	CogVideoX	0.90	0.91	79.8	55.1	24.7 (↓31.0%)
	Open-Sora	0.90	0.91	80.1	50.0	30.1 (↓37.6%)
	HunyuanVideo	0.89	0.91	83.0	61.6	21.4 (↓25.8%)
T2VAttack-I++	ModelScope	0.89	0.91	81.1	61.3	19.8 (↓24.4%)
	CogVideoX	0.90	0.91	79.8	62.3	17.5 (↓21.9%)
	Open-Sora	0.90	0.91	80.1	60.4	19.7 (↓24.6%)
	HunyuanVideo	0.89	0.91	83.0	67.1	15.9 (↓19.2%)
Temporal Attack						Temporal Difference
T2VAttack-S	ModelScope	0.87	0.80	45.2	9.3	35.9 (↓79.4%)
	CogVideoX	0.77	0.75	83.6	29.3	54.3 (↓65.0%)
	Open-Sora	0.82	0.77	67.9	19.4	48.5 (↓71.4%)
	HunyuanVideo	0.69	0.64	72.1	36.6	35.5 (↓49.2%)
T2VAttack-I	ModelScope	0.83	0.86	45.2	3.4	41.8 (↓92.5%)
	CogVideoX	0.82	0.86	83.6	20.7	62.9 (↓75.2%)
	Open-Sora	0.82	0.86	67.9	5.5	62.4 (↓91.9%)
	HunyuanVideo	0.84	0.86	72.1	42.2	29.9 (↓41.5%)
T2VAttack-I++	ModelScope	0.83	0.86	45.2	16.9	28.3 (↓62.6%)
	CogVideoX	0.82	0.86	83.6	33.3	50.3 (↓60.2%)
	Open-Sora	0.83	0.86	67.9	19.2	48.7 (↓71.7%)
	HunyuanVideo	0.85	0.86	72.1	50.0	22.1 (↓30.7%)

prompts from VBench and GPT-G, retaining the top- k samples with the highest video-text similarity and temporal dynamics scores. For Consensus Filtering, we perform the intersection of the four model-selected subsets. This rigorous process guarantees that prompts in T2VAttackBench: (1) produce videos with strong semantic consistency and dynamic fidelity under normal conditions, and (2) provide a “clean slate” for isolating degradation caused by attacks rather than exposing inherent weaknesses of the models. Detailed specifications, prompt templates, and the complete dataset are provided in the Supplementary Materials D.

B. Evaluation Metric

To comprehensively evaluate adversarial robustness of T2V models, we assess the adversarial prompts across three dimensions: stealthiness, efficacy, and efficiency.

For **adversarial prompt stealthiness**, we consider semantic similarity, formal similarity, and word modification count. The **semantic similarity** quantifies the degree to which an adversarial prompt X' preserves the semantic meaning of the original prompt X , computed as the cosine similarity between SentenceTransformer [70] embeddings. The **formal similarity** reflects the structural similarity between X and X' , quantified

via normalized Levenshtein distance. The **word modification count** denotes the number of word-level edits applied to X .

For **attack efficacy**, we measure the relative difference in the objective score before and after the attack, defined as $\Delta = f(G(X)) - f(G(X'))$, where f corresponds to either the semantic or temporal attack objective. We specifically refer to these as the **Semantic Difference** Δ_s and **Temporal Difference** Δ_t , representing the efficacy of the semantic and temporal attacks, respectively.

For **attack efficiency**, we report the total number of **queries** to the black-box T2V model, where each query corresponds to a complete video generation process.

C. Main Results

We conduct comprehensive experiments on four state-of-the-art T2V diffusion models, including ModelScope, CogVideoX, Open-Sora, and HunyuanVideo. Table II summarizes the performance comparison across two attack objectives (Semantic Attack and Temporal Attack) and two attack approaches (T2VAttack-S and T2VAttack-I). Several key observations emerge from the results: First, both semantic and temporal attacks are particularly effective in disrupting all four T2V models. Second, CogVideoX and Open-Sora models are more sensitive to semantic attacks. Specifically,

TABLE III
ABLATION STUDIES ON T2VATTACK-I STRATEGY UNDER VARYING CONDITIONS: (A) DIFFERENT VOCABULARY SOURCES, (B) VARYING WORD MODIFICATION COUNT AND QUERY ALLOCATIONS, (C) WORD INSERTION POSITIONS. GRAY IS THE DEFAULT SETTING.

(a) Vocabulary				(b) Word Edits			(c) Position	
Vocabulary Source	Original Size	Filtered Size	Semantic Difference	Words Edits	Query Count	Semantic Difference	Insertion Position	Semantic Difference
CLIP [22]	49,408	18,557	23.1	1	8	11.9	First	25.1
T5 [23]	32,000	11,188	22.2		16	16.7	Middle	21.6
LLaVA [24]	128,000	5,377	21.3		32	20.3	Last	20.0
					64	25.1	Random	21.1
BERT [74]	30,522	16,959	24.5	2	$4 + 1 \times 60$	28.6	Important	23.3
GPT2 [75]	50,257	3,641	20.6		$4 + 4 \times 15$	26.4		
Word2Vec [76]	3,000,000	80,313	23.4		$16 + 1 \times 48$	30.1		
GloVe [72]	400,001	74,495	25.1		$16 + 4 \times 12$	29.8		

TABLE IV
ABLATION STUDIES ON T2VATTACK-S STRATEGY UNDER VARYING CONDITIONS: (A) VARYING WORD MODIFICATION COUNT AND QUERY ALLOCATIONS, (B) SYNONYM FILTERING THRESHOLD θ , (C) ATTACK SCORE CRITERION τ_s ON SEMANTIC OBJECTIVE, (D) ATTACK SCORE CRITERION τ_t ON TEMPORAL OBJECTIVE. GRAY IS THE DEFAULT SETTING.

(a) Word Edits			(b) Synonym Threshold θ		(c) Semantic Criterion τ_s		(d) Temporal Criterion τ_t	
Words Edits	Query Count	Semantic Difference	Synonym Threshold	Semantic Difference	Semantic Criterion	Semantic Difference	Temporal Criterion	Temporal Difference
1	22.3	16.1	0.90	24.2	0.30	29.4	0.02	37.3
2	28.4	20.5	0.80	24.4	0.40	27.8	0.05	36.6
3	34.3	24.4	0.70	25.1	0.50	24.4	0.10	35.9
			0.60	25.2	0.60	21.6	0.15	35.3
			0.50	25.5	0.70	17.4	0.20	34.5

T2VAttack-S reduces the semantic score of the CogVideoX model by 34.0%, while T2VAttack-I decreases the semantic score of Open-Sora by 37.6%. Conversely, ModelScope and Open-Sora models are more sensitive to temporal attacks, with T2VAttack-I reducing the temporal dynamics score of ModelScope and Open-Sora by 92.5% and 91.9%, respectively. Third, HunyuanVideo demonstrates notably stronger robustness across different attack types. We attribute this robustness to its integrated prompt rewrite mechanism [73]. Fourth, T2VAttack-I is generally more advantageous than T2VAttack-S in temporal attacks. However, the rewrite mechanism [73] in HunyuanVideo effectively defends against this insertion strategy. While T2VAttack-I++ further enhances visual deception, it introduces a trade-off by slightly compromising overall performance.

D. Ablation Study

We perform extensive ablation studies and in-depth analyses of our attack methods. These include parameter ablations for three attack methods: T2VAttack-I, T2VAttack-S, and T2VAttack-I++, as well as three discussions covering: Text Editing Operations, Attack Stealthiness, and Part-of-Speech. All of these experiments are conducted on ModelScope.

1) *T2VAttack-I Ablations*: We first investigate how vocabulary selection affects the performance of the T2VAttack-I strategy in Table III-(a). Candidate vocabularies are derived from T2V-related text encoder (e.g., CLIP [22], T5 [23], LLaVA [24]), traditional NLP embeddings (Word2Vec [76], GloVe [72]), and large language models (BERT [74],

GPT [75]). Except for LLaVA, which employs the LLaVA-Llama-3-8B variant [77], all models use their official vocabularies. Since modern large models commonly employ subword tokenization, we apply a spell-check filter to retain only valid words. The results indicate that GloVe achieves the highest overall attack score of 25.1 with a filtered vocabulary size of 74,495 tokens. Despite a smaller post-filtering vocabulary, BERT retains competitive attack effectiveness. This suggests that carefully selecting a semantically relevant subset of words is crucial for attack efficacy. Table III-(b) analyzes the impact of word modifications and query counts on T2VAttack-I. Increasing the number of queries significantly enhances the semantic objective difference. Extending the attack to two-word insertions further reduces semantic similarity. For instance, allocating $16 + 4 \times 12$ queries reduces the semantic score of the ModelScope model by 29.8. This query allocation involved 16 queries to select the top 4 most influential words for the first prefix, followed by 12 queries for each of these words to select the second prefix, with a total of 64 queries. Notably, inserting a single prefix word with 64 queries generally achieves strong attack performance. Table III-(c) investigates the effect of insertion positions on T2VAttack-I. Surprisingly, inserting words at the beginning of the prompt proves to be the most effective, reducing the semantic score of ModelScope by 25.1. This even outperforms inserting a word at the most important position in the prompt, whose importance is calculated using Equation 4. In contrast, inserting a word at the end of the prompt has the least impact.

TABLE V
ABLATION STUDIES OF CHARACTER-LEVEL PERTURBATION COUNT ON
T2VATTACK-I++ STRATEGY. ‘-’ DENOTES T2VATTACK-I BASELINE
RESULTS. GRAY IS THE DEFAULT SETTING.

Char-perturbations Query Count	Semantic Difference
-	25.1
8	16.8
16	19.8
24	21.1
32	23.3

2) *T2VAttack-S Ablations*: Table IV analyzes the impact of word modifications and query allocations, synonym thresholds, and attack score thresholds on T2VAttack-S. The word modification count, which represents the maximum number of substitutable words, controls the query count during the attack process. This query count includes the importance calculation of each word in the prompt when ranking and querying adversarial prompts for synonym substitution. As shown in Table IV-(a), as the number of substitutable words increases, both the query count and attack effectiveness increase. To maintain the stealthiness of adversarial prompts, we limit the number of word modifications to no more than three. Table IV-(b) investigates the impact of the synonym threshold on T2VAttack-S. Since our synonym candidates are sourced from WordNet lexical databases, this candidate set already has a high similarity to the target words. As a result, the overall change in semantic similarity is minimal. However, this synonym filtering process can optimize synonym candidates for some adversarial prompts, thereby improving adversarial prompt stealthiness due to the polysemy inherent in WordNet.

Table IV-(c) and Table IV-(d) analyze the influence of attack score thresholds on T2VAttack-S in semantic and temporal attacks. The attack score threshold represents the exit criterion for the substitution process, and its optimal value differs significantly between semantic and temporal objectives. A higher criterion threshold corresponds to a looser exit condition for an attack, leading to lower attack effectiveness but improved efficiency. For simple examples, a low criterion threshold struggles to achieve high stealthiness and high-quality adversarial examples; for complex examples, a high criterion threshold makes it difficult to generate effective adversarial examples. Therefore, the criterion threshold represents a delicate trade-off between stealthiness and effectiveness in the T2VAttack-S strategy.

3) *T2VAttack-I++ Ablations*: Table V analyzes the impact of additional character-level perturbations on T2VAttack-I++. We treat the one-word, 64-query T2VAttack-I as the baseline, and then apply random character-level modifications to the inserted prefix words. These modifications, including character insertion, deletion, reordering, substitution, duplication, symbol replacement, and case flipping, obscure the newly added semantics and thereby enhance the attack’s stealthiness. Consequently, these perturbations initially decrease the semantic score difference due to the semantic disruption. However, as the number of character perturbations increases,

TABLE VI
COMPARISON OF VARYING TEXT EDITING OPERATIONS (SUBSTITUTION,
REORDERING, INSERTION, AND DELETION) AT DIFFERENT WORD
POSITIONS (FIRST AND IMPORTANT).

Text Editing	Position	Semantic Similarity	Formal Similarity	Semantic Difference
Insertion	First	0.89	0.91	25.1 (↓30.9%)
	Important	0.93	0.91	23.3 (↓28.7%)
Substitution	First	0.89	0.91	4.0 (↓4.9%)
	Important	0.82	0.91	21.6 (↓26.6%)
Deletion	First	0.97	0.91	2.4 (↓3.0%)
	Important	0.89	0.91	21.8 (↓26.9%)
Reordering	First	0.97	0.82	3.3 (↓4.1%)
	Important	0.98	0.82	7.9 (↓9.7%)

TABLE VII
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT STEALTHINESS CONDITIONS:
CHARACTER-LEVEL PERTURBATIONS AND RANDOM POSITION INSERTION
STRATEGY.

Stealthiness		Semantic Similarity	Formal Similarity	Semantic Difference
Character Perturbations	Random Insertion			
✓		0.89	0.91	25.1 (↓30.9%)
		0.89	0.91	19.8 (↓24.4%)
	✓	0.91	0.91	21.1 (↓26.0%)
✓	✓	0.91	0.91	17.2 (↓21.2%)

the reduction effect gradually diminishes. For attack efficiency, T2VAttack-I++ applies 16 additional character-level perturbation queries, yielding a total of 80 queries per attack.

4) *Text Editing Operations*: In NLP, four fundamental adversarial operations are widely employed in text classification tasks: substitution, reordering, insertion, and deletion [78]. We adopt analogous operations to assess the adversarial robustness of T2V models: substituting a word with a random word, reordering two words, inserting a random word, and deleting a word. For the substitution and insertion operations, the newly introduced random words are sourced from the GloVe vocabulary.

Table VI presents the impact of these varying text editing operations, with editing positions including the first position and the most important word position (determined by Equation 4). For example, the Insertion-Important operation inserts a random word before the most important word, while the Reordering-First operation swaps the first word with a randomly selected word. The results yield two key findings: First, the insertion operation exerts a significant influence on semantic similarity, whereas reordering has a minor effect. Second, substitution and deletion operations substantially reduce semantic similarity only when applied to the important word position, with negligible impact at other positions. Considering that the deletion operation introduces more noticeable modifications to the prompt, particularly when applied to important positions, we employ substitution and insertion as our two primary attack strategies. More experimental results and details for other editing positions are provided in Supplementary Materials E.




Fig. 3. Part-of-Speech (POS) analysis on T2VAttack-I. The figure plots the proportion difference between the POS distribution of the top- K most effective adversarial words and the full vocabulary, with a positive value indicating a higher likelihood of POS being effective adversarial tokens. (a) Semantic attacks: nouns dominate, strongly affecting semantic content. (b) Temporal attacks: nouns and verbs dominate, perturbing temporal dynamics.

5) *Attack Stealthiness*: For sentiment classification tasks in NLP, replacing “accept” with “reject” can flip the sentiment from positive to negative. In contrast, T2V models exhibit a lower tolerance for such obvious perturbations. For example, replacing “Two pandas discussing an academic paper” with “Two womens discussing an academic paper” may not constitute a successful adversarial example. To further enhance the stealthiness of adversarial perturbations, we introduce additional constraints into our attack methods.

In T2VAttack-S, we restrict the source of substituted words to synonyms and apply a three-step “filter-select-check” constraint mechanism. In T2VAttack-I, we consider two constraints to improve stealthiness: character-level perturbations and random insertion positions. Table VII shows the impact of these constraints on attack effectiveness, by semantic attacks on ModelScope. Character perturbations result in a negative impact of 5.3 in semantic similarity, while random insertion position causes a negative impact of 4.0. These results demonstrate a clear trade-off between attack stealthiness and effectiveness. It is worth noting that while character perturbations can obscure the intent of the introduced adversarial words, they are prone to be detected and corrected by specific methods [79]. For human observers, such perturbations improve stealthiness; for machines, they diminish it. Therefore, we retain both T2VAttack-I and T2VAttack-I++ to address different environmental conditions.

6) *Part-of-Speech (POS)*: To further investigate the behavior of the T2VAttack-I attack, we analyze the POS distribution of adversarial words under a 64-query, one-word insertion setting. Specifically, we compute the proportion difference between the POS distribution of the top- K lowest-scoring words (i.e., most effective adversarial words) and that of the full candidate vocabulary. A larger difference indicates that words of a particular POS type are more likely to dominate in terms of attack effectiveness.

As illustrated in Fig. 3, for **semantic attacks**, **nouns** show the largest increase in top- K representation, suggesting their strong impact on visual-semantic disruption. For **temporal at-**

tacks, both **nouns** and **verbs** contribute significantly, reflecting their critical ability in disturbing motion modeling and temporal consistency. These findings emphasize the importance of POS-aware adversarial strategies and provide insights into linguistic patterns that more effectively degrade T2V model performance.

E. Visualization

Fig. 4 provides representative visualization examples illustrating the effects of subtle textual perturbations introduced by T2VAttack-I, T2VAttack-S, and T2VAttack-I++ attacks across four T2V models: ModelScope, CogVideoX, OpenSora, and HunyuanVideo, with temporal attacks illustrated via optical flow magnitudes to highlight motion changes. Two key patterns emerge from these observations. First, T2VAttack-S emphasizes local and strict semantic constraints by replacing words with close synonyms. Utilizing a greedy search, it progressively modifies the prompt until the generated video exhibits clear semantic shifts or degraded temporal dynamics. Second, T2VAttack-I, limited to a single word insertion, strategically inserts the word most likely to introduce a conflicting or disruptive concept, thereby destabilizing the model’s ability to synthesize coherent visual narratives. Collectively, these examples underscore that even minor prompt perturbations can significantly compromise semantic fidelity and temporal consistency in T2V diffusion models. More challenging visualization results on HunyuanVideo are provided in Supplementary Materials F.

F. Limitation

Computational Cost: Both T2VAttack-S and T2VAttack-I are score-based black-box attacks. Such score-based attack methods require multiple queries to the victim model to obtain generated videos, and thus, the runtime depends on both the query count and the model’s inference time. T2V models are generally highly resource-intensive and time-consuming, for instance, producing the highest-quality video on HunyuanVideo can take up to 50 minutes per inference. Despite strict




Fig. 4. Visualization of adversarial attack effects across four T2V models (columns: ModelScope, CogVideoX, Open-Sora, HunyuanVideo). Rows correspond to: (1) Semantic attack - T2VAttack-S; (2) Semantic attack - T2VAttack-I; (3) Temporal attack - T2VAttack-S; (4) Temporal attack - T2VAttack-I. In Substitution rows, each example shows a pair (top: video generated from the original prompt; bottom: after T2VAttack-S). In Insertion rows, each example shows a triplet (top: original; middle: after T2VAttack-I; bottom: after T2VAttack-I++). For temporal attack cases, the corresponding optical flow magnitudes are visualized to expose motion degradation. These examples highlight that minor prompt perturbations can induce substantial degradation in semantic fidelity and temporal dynamics.

limitations on the number of queries, the overall attack process remains computationally expensive. **Challenges in Temporal Attack:** An effective temporal attack would ideally render the generated video completely static even when the prompt specifies dynamic content. For CogVideoX and HunyuanVideo, some adversarial prompts only partially diminish the temporal dynamics of the generated videos, while some trickily exploit degenerate solutions (e.g., shrinking the size of moving objects or reducing background motion) rather than fully eliminating motion. Consequently, achieving high-quality temporal attacks remains an open challenge for future research.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a pilot investigation into adversarial attacks on Text-to-Video diffusion models. We propose two prompt perturbation approaches, T2VAttack-S and T2VAttack-I, and evaluate them across two attack objectives that target semantic fidelity and temporal dynamics. Our experimental results reveal that even minor modifications can significantly induce semantic shifts or degenerate temporal dynamics in the generated videos, exposing critical vulnerabilities within current T2V models. Despite the simplicity of our methods, these findings underscore the urgent need to improve adversarial robustness in T2V generation. Future work should focus on developing effective countermeasures to mitigate such adversarial threats, thereby ensuring safer and more reliable content generation for real-world applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] OpenAI, “Video generation models as world simulators,” <https://openai.com/research/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators>, 2024.
- [2] J. Wang, H. Yuan, D. Chen, Y. Zhang, X. Wang, and S. Zhang, “Modelscape text-to-video technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06571*, 2023.
- [3] P. Esser, J. Chiu, P. Atighehchian, J. Granskog, and A. Germanidis, “Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 7346–7356.
- [4] Y. Wang, X. Chen, X. Ma, S. Zhou, Z. Huang, Y. Wang, C. Yang, Y. He, J. Yu, P. Yang *et al.*, “Lavie: High-quality video generation with cascaded latent diffusion models,” *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 133, no. 5, pp. 3059–3078, 2025.
- [5] H. Chen, Y. Zhang, X. Cun, M. Xia, X. Wang, C. Weng, and Y. Shan, “Videocrafter2: Overcoming data limitations for high-quality video diffusion models,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 7310–7320.
- [6] Z. Yang, J. Teng, W. Zheng, M. Ding, S. Huang, J. Xu, Y. Yang, W. Hong, X. Zhang, G. Feng *et al.*, “Cogvideox: Text-to-video diffusion models with an expert transformer,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [7] F. Long, Z. Qiu, T. Yao, and T. Mei, “Videodrafter: Content-consistent multi-scene video generation with llm,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01256*, 2024.
- [8] A. Wang, B. Ai, B. Wen, C. Mao, C.-W. Xie, D. Chen, F. Yu, H. Zhao, J. Yang, J. Zeng *et al.*, “Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20314*, 2025.
- [9] H. Liu, Y. Wu, S. Zhai, B. Yuan, and N. Zhang, “Riatig: Reliable and imperceptible adversarial text-to-image generation with natural prompts,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 20 585–20 594.
- [10] H. Zhuang, Y. Zhang, and S. Liu, “A pilot study of query-free adversarial attack against stable diffusion,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 2385–2392.
- [11] Y. Yang, R. Gao, X. Wang, T.-Y. Ho, N. Xu, and Q. Xu, “Mma-diffusion: Multimodal attack on diffusion models,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 7737–7746.
- [12] J. H. Holland, “Genetic algorithms,” *Scientific american*, vol. 267, no. 1, pp. 66–73, 1992.
- [13] A. Madry, A. Makelov, L. Schmidt, D. Tsipras, and A. Vladu, “Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [14] V. Temlyakov, *Greedy approximation*. Cambridge University Press, 2011, vol. 20.
- [15] D. Jin, Z. Jin, J. T. Zhou, and P. Szolovits, “Is bert really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment,” in *AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 05, 2020, pp. 8018–8025.
- [16] Z. Huang, Y. He, J. Yu, F. Zhang, C. Si, Y. Jiang, Y. Zhang, T. Wu, Q. Jin, N. Chanpaisit *et al.*, “Vbench: Comprehensive benchmark suite for video generative models,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 21 807–21 818.
- [17] Z. Zheng, X. Peng, T. Yang, C. Shen, S. Li, H. Liu, Y. Zhou, T. Li, and Y. You, “Open-sora: Democratizing efficient video production for all,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20404*, 2024.
- [18] W. Kong, Q. Tian, Z. Zhang, R. Min, Z. Dai, J. Zhou, J. Xiong, X. Li, B. Wu, J. Zhang *et al.*, “Hunyuanvideo: A systematic framework for large video generative models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.03603*, 2024.
- [19] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, E. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [20] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [21] W. Peebles and S. Xie, “Scalable diffusion models with transformers,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 4195–4205.
- [22] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [23] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer,” *Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5485–5551, 2020.
- [24] H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Lee, “Visual instruction tuning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 34 892–34 916, 2023.
- [25] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, “Auto-encoding variational bayes,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.
- [26] A. Van Den Oord, O. Vinyals *et al.*, “Neural discrete representation learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [27] P. Esser, R. Rombach, and B. Ommer, “Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 12 873–12 883.
- [28] U. Singer, A. Polyak, T. Hayes, X. Yin, J. An, S. Zhang, Q. Hu, H. Yang, O. Ashual, O. Gafni *et al.*, “Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [29] J. Ho, W. Chan, C. Saharia, J. Whang, R. Gao, A. Gritsenko, D. P. Kingma, B. Poole, M. Norouzi, D. J. Fleet *et al.*, “Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022.
- [30] A. Blattmann, T. Dockhorn, S. Kulal, D. Mendelevitch, M. Kilian, D. Lorenz, Y. Levi, Z. English, V. Voleti, A. Letts *et al.*, “Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15127*, 2023.
- [31] PikaLabs, “Pika 1.5,” <https://pika.art/>, 2024.10.
- [32] Kuaishou, “Kling ai,” <https://klingai.kuaishou.com/>, 2024.06.
- [33] Runway, “Gen-3,” <https://runwayml.com/>, 2024.06.
- [34] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy, “Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- [35] N. Carlini and D. Wagner, “Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks,” in *Security and Privacy*. Ieee, 2017, pp. 39–57.
- [36] A. Ilyas, L. Engstrom, A. Athalye, and J. Lin, “Black-box adversarial attacks with limited queries and information,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018, pp. 2137–2146.
- [37] R. Liu, W. Zhou, T. Zhang, K. Chen, J. Zhao, and K.-Y. Lam, “Boosting black-box attack to deep neural networks with conditional diffusion models,” *Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 5207–5219, 2024.
- [38] Y. Xu, P. Dai, Z. Li, H. Wang, and X. Cao, “The best protection is attack: Fooling scene text recognition with minimal pixels,” *Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 18, pp. 1580–1595, 2023.

- [39] Q. Guo, S. Pang, X. Jia, Y. Liu, and Q. Guo, "Efficient generation of targeted and transferable adversarial examples for vision-language models via diffusion models," *Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2024.
- [40] Y. Dong, F. Liao, T. Pang, H. Su, J. Zhu, X. Hu, and J. Li, "Boosting adversarial attacks with momentum," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 9185–9193.
- [41] J. Gao, J. Lanchantin, M. L. Soffa, and Y. Qi, "Black-box generation of adversarial text sequences to evade deep learning classifiers," in *Security and Privacy Workshops*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 50–56.
- [42] S. Eger, G. G. Şahin, A. Rücklé, J.-U. Lee, C. Schulz, M. Mesgar, K. Swarnkar, E. Simpson, and I. Gurevych, "Text processing like humans do: Visually attacking and shielding nlp systems," in *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019, pp. 1634–1647.
- [43] Y. Yao, C. Wang, H. Wang, K. Wang, Y. Ren, and W. Meng, "Embedding secret message in chinese characters via glyph perturbation and style transfer," *Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 4406–4419, 2024.
- [44] M. Alzantot, Y. Sharma, A. Elgohary, B.-J. Ho, M. Srivastava, and K.-W. Chang, "Generating natural language adversarial examples," in *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2018, pp. 2890–2896.
- [45] L. Li, R. Ma, Q. Guo, X. Xue, and X. Qiu, "Bert-attack: Adversarial attack against bert using bert," in *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2020, pp. 6193–6202.
- [46] N. Papernot, P. McDaniel, A. Swami, and R. Harang, "Crafting adversarial input sequences for recurrent neural networks," in *Military Communications Conference*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 49–54.
- [47] S. Ren, Y. Deng, K. He, and W. Che, "Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency," in *Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019, pp. 1085–1097.
- [48] X. Hu, G. Liu, B. Zheng, L. Zhao, Q. Wang, Y. Zhang, and M. Du, "Fasttextdodger: Decision-based adversarial attack against black-box nlp models with extremely high efficiency," *Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 19, pp. 2398–2411, 2024.
- [49] Z. Zhao, D. Dua, and S. Singh, "Generating natural adversarial examples," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [50] M. Iyyer, J. Wieting, K. Gimpel, and L. Zettlemoyer, "Adversarial example generation with syntactically controlled paraphrase networks," in *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2018, pp. 1875–1885.
- [51] V. T. Truong, L. B. Dang, and L. B. Le, "Attacks and defenses for generative diffusion models: A comprehensive survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 1–44, 2025.
- [52] H. Salman, A. Khaddaj, G. Leclerc, A. Ilyas, and A. Madry, "Raising the cost of malicious ai-powered image editing," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023, pp. 29894–29918.
- [53] S. Shan, J. Cryan, E. Wenger, H. Zheng, R. Hanocka, and B. Y. Zhao, "Glaze: Protecting artists from style mimicry by {Text-to-Image} models," in *USENIX Security Symposium*, 2023, pp. 2187–2204.
- [54] J. Zhang, Z. Xu, S. Cui, C. Meng, W. Wu, and M. R. Lyu, "On the robustness of latent diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08257*, 2023.
- [55] H. Yu, J. Chen, X. Ding, Y. Zhang, T. Tang, and H. Ma, "Step vulnerability guided mean fluctuation adversarial attack against conditional diffusion models," in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 7, 2024, pp. 6791–6799.
- [56] C. Zhang, L. Wang, and A. Liu, "Revealing vulnerabilities in stable diffusion via targeted attacks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08725*, 2024.
- [57] Q. Liu, A. Kortylewski, Y. Bai, S. Bai, and A. Yuille, "Discovering failure modes of text-guided diffusion models via adversarial search," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [58] Z. Kou, S. Pei, Y. Tian, and X. Zhang, "Character as pixels: A controllable prompt adversarial attacking framework for black-box text guided image generation models," in *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2023, pp. 983–990.
- [59] Y. Yang, B. Hui, H. Yuan, N. Gong, and Y. Cao, "Sneakyprompt: Jailbreaking text-to-image generative models," in *Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 897–912.
- [60] H. Gao, H. Zhang, Y. Dong, and Z. Deng, "Evaluating the robustness of text-to-image diffusion models against real-world attacks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13103*, 2023.
- [61] C. Liang, X. Wu, Y. Hua, J. Zhang, Y. Xue, T. Song, Z. Xue, R. Ma, and H. Guan, "Adversarial example does good: preventing painting imitation from diffusion models via adversarial examples," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023, pp. 20763–20786.
- [62] C. Liang and X. Wu, "Mist: Towards improved adversarial examples for diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12683*, 2023.
- [63] P. Zhu, T. Takahashi, and H. Kataoka, "Watermark-embedded adversarial examples for copyright protection against diffusion models," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 24420–24430.
- [64] T. Van Le, H. Phung, T. H. Nguyen, Q. Dao, N. N. Tran, and A. Tran, "Anti-dreambooth: Protecting users from personalized text-to-image synthesis," in *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 2116–2127.
- [65] J. Kang, H. Yang, Y. Cai, H. Zhang, X. Xu, Y. Du, and S. He, "Sita: Structurally imperceptible and transferable adversarial attacks for stylized image generation," *Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2025.
- [66] J. Liu, S. Liang, S. Zhao, R. Tu, W. Zhou, A. Liu, D. Tao, and S. K. Lam, "T2v-optjail: Discrete prompt optimization for text-to-video jailbreak attacks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.06679*, 2025.
- [67] Y. Wang, Y. He, Y. Li, K. Li, J. Yu, X. Ma, X. Li, G. Chen, X. Chen, Y. Wang *et al.*, "Internvid: A large-scale video-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [68] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 10684–10695.
- [69] Z. Teed and J. Deng, "Raft: Recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 402–419.
- [70] N. Reimers and I. Gurevych, "Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation," in *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2020, pp. 4512–4525.
- [71] G. A. Miller, "Wordnet: a lexical database for english," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 39–41, 1995.
- [72] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning, "Glove: Global vectors for word representation," in *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2014, pp. 1532–1543.
- [73] X. Sun, Y. Chen, Y. Huang, R. Xie, J. Zhu, K. Zhang, S. Li, Z. Yang, J. Han, X. Shu *et al.*, "Hunyuan-large: An open-source moe model with 52 billion activated parameters by tencent," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02265*, 2024.
- [74] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," in *North American chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.
- [75] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners," *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019.
- [76] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, "Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space," in *International Conference on Learning Representations Workshop*, 2013.
- [77] X. Contributors, "Xtuner: A toolkit for efficiently fine-tuning llm," <https://github.com/InternLM/xtuner>, 2023.
- [78] X. Zhang, H. Hong, Y. Hong, P. Huang, B. Wang, Z. Ba, and K. Ren, "Text-crs: A generalized certified robustness framework against textual adversarial attacks," in *Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 2920–2938.
- [79] S. Goyal, S. Doddapaneni, M. M. Khapra, and B. Ravindran, "A survey of adversarial defenses and robustness in nlp," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 14s, pp. 1–39, 2023.

BIOGRAPHY SECTION



Changzhen Li is currently pursuing a Ph.D. degree at the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS), Beijing, China. He received his Bachelor's degree (B.S.) from East China Normal University, Shanghai, China, in 2018, and his Master's degree (M.S.) from the Institute of Computing Technology (ICT), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing, China, in 2022. His research interests include video understanding and the safety of video generation.



Yuecong Min received the BS degree in information and computing science from Shandong University in 2017. He received PhD degree in computer science from the Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences in 2024. He is currently a postdoctoral researcher with the Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences. His research interests are in computer vision, pattern recognition, and machine learning. He especially focuses on sign language processing, vision-language modeling and the related research topics.



Jie Zhang (Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing, China. He is currently an Associate Professor with the Institute of Computing Technology, CAS. His research interests include computer vision, pattern recognition, machine learning, particularly include adversarial attacks and defenses, domain generalization, AI safety and trustworthiness.



Zheng Yuan received the B.S. degree from University of Chinese Academy of Sciences in 2019. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree from University of Chinese Academy of Sciences. His research interest includes adversarial example and model robustness. He has authored several academic papers in international conferences including ICCV/ECCV/ICPR and journals including TPAMI/IJCV.



Shiguang Shan (Fellow, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the Institute of Computing Technology (ICT), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing, China, in 2004. He has been a Full Professor with ICT since 2010, where he is currently the Director of the Key Laboratory of Intelligent Information Processing, CAS. His research interests include signal processing, computer vision, pattern recognition, and machine learning. He has published more than 300 articles in related areas. He served as the General Co-Chair for IEEE Face and Gesture Recognition 2023, the General Co-Chair for Asian Conference on Computer Vision (ACCV) 2022, and the Area Chair of many international conferences, including CVPR, ICCV, AAAI, IJCAI, ACCV, ICPR, and FG. He was/is an Associate Editors of several journals, including IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, Neurocomputing, CVIU, and PRL. He was a recipient of the China's State Natural Science Award in 2015 and the China's State S&T Progress Award in 2005 for his research work.



Xilin Chen (Fellow, IEEE) is currently a Professor with the Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS). He has authored one book and more than 400 articles in refereed journals and proceedings in the areas of computer vision, pattern recognition, image processing, and multi modal interfaces. He is a fellow of the ACM, IAPR, and CCF. He is also an Information Sciences Editorial Board Member of Fundamental Research, an Editorial Board Member of Research, a Senior Editor of the Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation, and an Associate Editor-in-Chief of the Chinese Journal of Computers and Chinese Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence. He served as an organizing committee member for multiple conferences, including the General Co-Chair of FG 2013/FG 2018, VCIP 2022, the Program Co-Chair of ICMI 2010/FG 2024, and an Area Chair of ICCV/CVPR/ECCV/NeurIPS for more than ten times.